

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

DEC 26 1929

VOL. L, 4

WHOLE No. 200

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK, WILFRED P. MUSTARD,
D. M. ROBINSON

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER
1929

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Notes on Hofmann's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik. By EMORY B. LEASE, - - - - -	319
Literary Imitation in the Theognidea. By E. L. HIGHBARGER,	341
A Pre-Indo-European Change of <i>u</i> to <i>m</i> after <i>u</i> or <i>a</i> . By E. H. STURTEVANT, - - - - -	360
Three Etymologies in Early Celtic. By LOUIS H. GRAY, - -	370
Statius: <i>Silvae</i> III. v. 93. By A. W. VANBUREN, - - - -	372
An Early Use of the Accentual Clausula. By CHARLES UPSON CLARK, - - - - -	374
Oriental Elements in Petronius. By MOSES HADAS, - - -	378
Two Papyrus Fragments of Homer. By CLINTON W. KEYES, -	386
Addendum on Ithaca. By F. P. JOHNSON, - - - - -	389
REPORTS: - - - - -	390
Glotta, Vol. XVIII (1929), 1-2 (ROLAND G. KENT).—Philo- logus, Vol. LXXXIII (1928) (HARRISON C. COFFIN).	
REVIEWS: - - - - -	399
<i>Edwin Flinck-Linkomies'</i> De ablativo absoluto quaestiones (H. C. NUTTING).— <i>Albert Severyns'</i> Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque (JOHN A. SCOTT).— <i>H.</i> <i>Sjögren's</i> M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum epistularum libri sedecim, Fasc. II (TENNEY FRANK).— <i>Hennig</i> <i>Brinkmann's</i> Zum Ursprung des liturgischen Spieles (GRACE FRANK).— <i>Palaeographia Latina</i> , Part V (CHARLES UPSON CLARK).— <i>W. P. Mustard's</i> Aeneae Silvii de Curialium miseriis epistola (CHARLES UPSON CLARK).	
ERRATA, - - - - -	409
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	409
INDEX, - - - - -	413

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. L, 4

WHOLE No. 200

NOTES ON HOFMANN'S LATEINISCHE SYNTAX UND STILISTIK.

Almost twenty years have elapsed since the appearance of Schmalz's Fourth Edition of the *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, a book of outstanding importance.¹ The new Edition is most welcome. As an authoritative compendium of our knowledge up to 1928 Hofmann's book is invaluable and indispensable. And it is not simply a careful and judicious revision of its predecessor. In effect it is a new and independent piece of work, with a more logical and discriminating arrangement of old material, and with the introduction of much new material. Greater emphasis is placed upon Late Latin usages, upon Colloquial and Popular² modes of expression (often with the inclusion of their survival in the Romance Languages), and due attention is given to the light that recent investigations in the Italic Dialects have shed upon Latin usages. And new categories³ appear, classified in the Index. The Editor is to be

¹ Each new edition is a marvel of condensation, but with a constantly increasing need of enlargement: the 3rd, appearing in 1900, with an increase of 100 pp., the 4th, in 1910, of 110 pp., and now the 5th, 1928, of 204 pp., accompanied by a comprehensive and illuminating chapter (35 pp.) on the "Entwicklung und Stand der Lateinischen Sprachforschung". For this increase the Classical world is most grateful. However, though the Editor deserves the highest praise, the Publisher is open to criticism: the increase in the price of the book from 17 Marks to 48 Marks accompanied by a marked decrease in the quality of the paper used! In a book intended for a permanent record the use of such inferior paper that it will not stand ink is a serious drawback to those who desire to make marginal annotations.

² "Umgangssprache" (105 citations) and "Volkssprache" (79).

³ As "Sondersprachen" (51), "Kirchensprache" (5), "Sakral-

congratulated upon the completion of a large and important piece of work. In a book in which there is so much to commend in the highest terms, it is a matter of regret that it cannot be given unqualified praise. And it should be said that in a work of so vast a scope, with thousands of details, with countless problems of exclusion and inclusion, some details would naturally be open to criticism. The Editor, being the "Redaktor am Thes. Ling. Lat. in München", is in an exceptionally favorable position for speedily acquiring an accurate and complete history of a particular Latin usage, for ascertaining its first appearance and early course and tracing its development down to its latest manifestations, yet he himself informs us in his Vorwort (p. viii) that he has made use of such material only so far as recorded in the Archiv, i. e. up to 1908! In recording the history of a particular usage sufficient care has not always been taken in citing authors in their strictly chronological order, in differentiating between the exceptional and the regular usage, in always making it clear when one passage is cited for an author that he has not used it oftener. This is likely to cause confusion. And, too, in some instances lists of three or four authors are cited for a certain usage with an "u. ö.", an "al.", or an "u. s. w." appended, leading to the inference that where such is not added the list up to that point is not only complete, but that the usage is not found later. Of course, in a work of this character incompleteness of citations or inaccuracies of statement are often due to a faulty record in the authority used.

The following comments are here added in the hope that they may be of service in a later reprint or a subsequent edition.

P. 347, 6: Riemann & Lejay *Synt. lat.* should be cited in a later edition (1927).

P. 361, 180: cite also Grandgent *From Latin to Italian* (1927).

sprache" (6), as well as "Hebraismen" (10) and "Gräzismen" (105). And, too, Magic and Theology have invaded this realm, certain usages being referred to the "Zaubersprache" and "Zauberkräft" (pp. 28, 34), to the 'Evil Eye' (*invideo* p. 412), to "Heilige" Numbers (p. 492), to the "Auguralsprache" (p. 493), to the "Sprache der Götter und Geister" (pp. 22, 35), and *Tabu* (pp. 28, 29, 824, 836, 838).

P. 373, Lit.: cite also M. Schlossarek *Spr.-vergl. Kasusbe-trachtung im Lat. u. Gr.* (1913).

P. 377 b): *egredior* with Accus., cited by others for Sall. Jug. 110, 8, is, however, from a speech by Bocchus.

P. 379 Lit.: add W. Hamilton Kirk *Cl. Weekly* XIII (1920) pp. 91 f.; 98 f., "The accusative of specification."

P. 382, l. 5: note that the "Abl. Dur." is not justified so much by the "nebenstehendes Adj." as by the character of the Adj., as by the use of *tota* which logically makes the action "ununterbrochen" (especially when reinforced, as in Caes. B. G. 1, 46, 1 by *continenter*), or by the use of *omni*, as in Hor. C. II, 3, 5. Note *toto die* Curt. 6, 8, 12; *toto die . . . tota nocte* Sen. Contr. 1, 5, 2; *tota die* Just. 31, 2, 3; *tota nocte* Juv. 10, 206; Mart. 7, 10, 6; and the use of *perpetuo* in Ter. Ad. 527, of *perducere* in 520; of *permanebit* in Columella 2, 10, 28 and of *semper* in Livy 21, 16, 5. From such usages it passed to others where it was not so well justified, as even in Caes. B. C. 1, 7, 7; 47, 3; 3, 59, 1 and even to such expressions as *vixit annis* as in Vell. 1, 1, 3; Sen. Ep. 75, 23; 93, 3 etc., a usage becoming common in Late Latin. Note also that Just. says *per annos* in 2, 8, 10; 40, 1, 4 and *annos* with *natus est* in 6, 5, 2; 11, 1, 9; 12, 16, 3 etc.

P. 385, *id genus*: it should be noted that *id genus* appears first in Ennius (not Lucilius) and reaches its climax in Gellius, who uses it 30 times, not 20 (Müller l. c.; to ALL l. c. add 11, 15, 8 and also Enn. Var. 70 (V), Suet. Tib. 69 and Ammian. 16, 7, 7). *Muliebre secus* is also used by Suet. Aug. 44, 3; *id temporis* also by Vell. 2, 4, 6 and Gell. 12, 1, 7; 13, 11, 4; 18, 6, 1.

P. 386: note that (with the Acc. exclam.) Prudentius uses *O* 4 times, *En* 3 times, *Ecce* once (Lease *Prud.* p. 17) and that Symm. Ep. I, 80 has: *En tibi litteras*; compare also II, 19; VI, 56.

P. 389 f.: note that *in id loci* appears already in Ter. Phorm. 979 (as was noted in A.J.P. XX (1899) p. 60); that Cic. Att. 4, 3, 3 is doubtful, and "epist." here and elsewhere is used for *Fam.*; that Livy 22, 20, 10 has *ad interiora provinciae* (cf. Curt. 4, 7, 5; 9, 1, 8) and Suet. Tit. 8, 5 has *inter adversa temporum*; that possibly *interea loci* was used by Pacuv. 76; that

Auct. Her. 1, 21 has *per id temporis* and Vell. 2, 4, 6 has *ad id temporis*; *id aevi* was used by Apul. *Flor.* 15 (p. 21, 6 H.). In β note Stat. *Th.* 2, 152, *egregii iuvenum*: in ϵ Ovid (*Pont.* 3, 9, 44 *unus amicorum*) should be inserted before Livy.

P. 404, l. 2: note that with *plenus* Hor. always uses the Gen., Prop. always the Abl., but Verg. uses both (Gen. E. 3, 60; Aen. I, 460; Abl. G. 2, 4,; 4, 181; A. 5, 311; 9, 456) and see also Lease A.J.P. 30, 404; *opulentus*: earlier in Hor. C. 1, 17, 16; *nudus opum*: also in Sil. (4, 606; 14, 343 omitted by Draeger I, p. 478 also); *certus*: Lucan (8, 120), Sil. (6, 27), Quint. (4, 3, 8), Tac. (Ann. 12, 32), Plin. (6, 16, 12); *matu-rior aevi* Claud. *Cons. Stil.* 2, 348.

P. 405, l. 6: note the use of *compos mentis* by Ovid *Met.* 8, 35; d: *macte* Stat. *Theb.* 2, 495: note that Klotz a.l. cites Pomp. G. L. V, 188, 13 *macte virtutis*, and that Th. Birt *Rh. Mus.* 77 (1928) pp. 199 f. explains *macte* in the phrase *macte esto* as originally as adverb. Wackernagel *Vorl. üb. Synt.* I (1926) p. 309 regards it as a Votive with more probability.

P. 406, l. 8: note the use of *metuens futuri* in Hor. S. 2, 2, 110; Lucan 2, 223; *metuens virgae* in Juv. 7, 210; also that for *sciens* Jug. 85, 15 is cited instead of 85, 45; 32, a): note *te oblitus sum* Liv. Andr. frg. 4 (B), and for Petronius see Lease A.J.P. 21 (1901) p. 449.

P. 407, c: *misereor*, c. gen.: note Sil. 11, 379 *poenae indignae* and Min. Fel. *Oct.* 38 *eorum*, and that Commodianus II, 38, 3 has *miseratus egenis*; d, *compleo* c. gen.: revise statement in light of Schmalz § 102 and Kuehner II, 1, 467.

P. 408, l. 4, *egeo* with Gen.: in Livy, however, only used twice, elsewhere with the Abl. (M. Müller, crit. note to III, 28, 10); for its use in the Silver Age see Lease A.J.P. XXI, pp. 449 f.; l. 14, *opus est* c. gen. Altlat.: misleading, as Bennett cites none, Kühner II, 1, 388 and Schmalz citing only Lucilius 33; *refert*: see Lease A.J.P. 30, p. 338; in regard to *interest* also see Elmer *Lat. Gram.* (1928) p. 127 and *Class. Weekly* XX (1926) p. 62.

P. 410 Lit.: add Fay *Cl. Quart.* V (1911) pp. 185 f. and F. Solmsen "Zur Geschichte des Dativs i. d. indogerm. Spr." *Z. f. Sprach.* 44 pp. 61-123.

P. 412 *invideo*: Verg. however uses the Acc. (*umbras*) and Dat. in *Ecl.* 7, 58 and *Geo.* I, 503 (*te*) i. e. not "erst seit Verg.

Aen. 11, 42", not to mention an earlier use of the acc. in Accius (cited by Bennett II, p. 212); at the end add: S. Wunsch *Rh. Mus.* 49, 1 (cf. *Jahresb.* 1911 p. 103, No. 154) and Lease A.J.P. 28, p. 52. Zusatz: note that the construction *nomen est* is discussed by Gellius, and that he prefers the Nom., 4 (1, 2, 2; 11, 14; 5, 14, 10; 13, 2, 2) to the Dat. once (17, 21, 31), and with *cognomentum* uses only the Nom., as 4, 3, 2; 17, 21, 6 (as Quint. 6, 1, 41). At end of II add Lindsay *Pl. Synt.* p. 22.

P. 417 Dat. iudicantis: also in Verg. *Ecl.* 2, 44 (tibi: 'in your eyes', omitted by ALL 8, 51) and Tac. *Ann.* 1, 32, 7 *coniectantibus* (omitted on p. 54); Dat. auctoris: note Livy 22, 19, 12 *agmini intrabile* and Sen. *Ep.* 121, 22 *nulli imitabilis* (cf. Hor. C. 1, 24, 10 *nulli flebilior*), and to Lit. add ALL 1, 603; 11, 594 and A. Green "The Dative of Agency" (Columbia Univ. Press 1913).

P. 418 a) Dat. finalis: noteworthy: Nepos 4, 4, 6 and 23, 10, 6 *magno praemio*; *admirationi* in Sen. *Ep.* 33, 1; *incommodo* in Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 3, 7; *potui datur* in Celsus 2, 13; 3, 6; 5, 25, 3; Marc. Emp. 1, 52; 3, 8; 4, 27; 69; 6, 5. To b), *frugi*, Lit.: add Lease A.J.P. 28, p. 46, ftn.

P. 426, l. 6: but *assueto* is used earlier, Ovid *Her.* 6, 72.

P. 427, d: note *a te dignior* Ovid *Her.* 16, 98; A. A. 1, 139 *proximus a domino*, and note that Woelfflin in ALL 12, 384 rejects the view expressed in 7, 124; add also Pfister *Rh. Mus.* 68 (1912) pp. 159 f.

P. 428, e: note that M. Morgan "Addresses and Stud." (1910) pp. 199 f. denies the Gen. of Comparison to Vitruvius. f): note Ovid *Met.* 13, 587 *inferior omnibus* (cf. 360); *Pont.* 2, 76, 1; *nulli secundus* in Livy 23, 10, 7 and Vell. 2, 76, 1 and to Lit. add Schmalz *Glotta* V (1910) p. 210.

P. 429, a: for the detailed usage of *misceo* see Lease A.J.P. 30, pp. 300 f.

P. 430 c): with *pluit* Livy uses the Abl. much more often (29) than the Acc. (4): Lease A.J.P. 30, 304; *sudat*: the Abl. is also used by Sil. 2, 455 and Florus 2, 8, 3 (both omitted by Kühner II, 1, 384); *manare*: also by Livy and Lucan; *natare*, also by Verg. (G. I, 372; Aen. 3, 625) and Stat. (Th. 2, 337); both omitted by Kühner l. c.).

P. 435 ε: *potior* is used with 3 cases by Plt. (Lease A.J.P.

30, 305); p. 436: Cato's use of the Acc. with *utor* (Agr. 118, 123, 142, 143, 157) should be noted.

P. 441, *dignus*, add: see Skutsch *Glotta* II pp. 151 f. and Morgan op. cit. pp. 214 f.; a) note *tota urbe* Cic. Att. 14, 8, 2 and compare note on *tota die* P. 382, l. 5 *supra*.

P. 443: note the striking preference of Val. Max. also: *gratia* 25, *causa* 12; *ergo*: note, however, that *ergo* is used but twice by Lucr. (3, 78; 5, 1246) and but once by Verg. (Aen. 6, 670), not at all by Hor. It is also used in the *Tab. Triumph.* 1, 11 (p. 55 B.). Instructive is Cic. *Fam.* 11, 22, 1 vel *humanitatis* tuae vel *mea* causa.

P. 445 γ): note *multum improbrores* Plt. *Most.* 824 and Sil. 13, 708, and cf. Lease A.J.P. 21, 449 and 30, 301.

P. 447 Das Part. Fut. Akt. im Abl. abs. zuerst bei Pollio dann bei Liv. 28, 15, 13; but see Lease A.J.P. 49, p. 353; it is also used by Val. Max. 1, 7, 3; Sil. 16, 232: Juv. 14, 59; Macrobian. 1, 24, 15; and to Lit. add: Lease A.J.P. 40, p. 281.

P. 448 γ) Abl. abs. with Conjunctions: for corrections and additions see Lease A.J.P. 49 (1928) pp. 348 f. b) Subst. Part. Perf. Pass., "häufiger vor allem bei Liv. Curt. Tac.": however, Curt. is hardly worthy of such a distinction; and, too, it should be noted that Hor. uses *excepto quod* but once, l. c. Note also its use in Ovid *Pont.* 4, 14, 3 and Plin. min. 7, 32, 10; 8, 1, 1 (*exceptis qui Pont.* 1, 2, 136, as in Sall. *Jug.* 106, 3 (omitted by Kuehner II, 1, 773)), *cognito quod* Just. 32, 3, 14 and note Curt. 5, 13, 1 *audito* Dareum movisse (add to K. l. c. p. 779); and *pacto ut* Liv. 28, 21, 5. d), Nom. abs.: add, "im Vulgärlatein beliebt"; see Pfister Rh. M. 67, 206.

P. 458 d): after Sen. insert Quint. (2, 17, 30; 35).

P. 489 b): note that Verg., Hor. and Sen. phil. always use *nulli* instead of *nemini*, and that the "uä." before "erst seit Val. Max." needs, in view of Neue-W. II, pp. 524 f., clarification; that *nemo unus* was used 6 times by Livy (Drakenborch to 3, 12, 4 omits 38, 50, 8; Draeger I, p. 100 cites 9, 17 quilibet unus, and omits Plin. mai. 3, 1); *quisquam unus* is used 6 times (Draeger omitting 3, 55, 15; 39, 50, 2).

P. 493, *Zusatz ter novenae*: to be explained rather as a multiplication of mystic potencies.

P. 495 c): note *ex ante diem* in Cic. Att. 3, 17, 1 and Livy

45, 2, 12, and *in ante diem* in Livy 41, 16, 5; 17, 5; 43, 16, 12; 45, 3, 2.

P. 503 *propius*, line two: insert "als Adj. oder Adv."; line three, insert Liv. (as 22, 45, 6), and note that Verg. uses the Dat. with *propius* (adv.) only 3 times (to Kuehner II, l. 528 add Aen. 8, 556. Note that Liv. 44, 40, 4 now has the Acc.).

P. 504 *propter quod, quae*: more precisely "seit Liv." (as 23, 28, 3; 9, 44, 2); note *propter me* in Ov. *Her.* 3, 89 (bis), as in Cic. *Mil.* 58.

P. 506, line 7, *ob quae*: between Liv. and Tac. insert Celsus (pp. 12, 27; 116, 10; 206, 32 D.); *ob haec* Plin. mai. 18, 114; Curt. 9, 8, 24 and *ob id* Plin. mai. 16, 110; Curt. 4, 16, 7 etc.

P. 508 *ultra* "zeitliche": should say seit Liv. (as 2, 19, 2).

P. 516: note that *praeter haec* is already found in Ter. *Ad.* 847.

P. 521, near end: note Cicero's use of *per iram* in Tusc. 4, 79 and compare Liv. 43, 11, 10 *per ambitionem* ("das Motiv").

P. 522 b): note Bréal *Semantics* (1900) p. 19: "In an inscription of Misenum of the year 159 A. D. is written *per multo tempore*".

P. 533 *Kausales prae*: used earlier by Liv. Andr. frg. 17 (B): *frixit prae pavore cor*. Note also its use in a positive clause, Liv. 6, 40, 1 *prae indignitate defixisset*.

P. 535 *Procul*: *procul dubio* already appears in Cato (Gell. 6, 7, 6); after "Enn. sc. 260 dann" insert Sat. 50 (*dubio procul*), Acc. (Gell. 3, 11, 5), and note that *dubio procul* was used by Florus 12, 8, 7 (but *p. dubio* in 2, 6, 50; 3, 28, 3), and that *procul dubio* is also used by Columella R. R. 3, 10, 9; Ammian. 16, 12, 33; see further Lease A.J.P. 21, p. 451.

P. 536 *Tenus*: with Cic. Arat. *lumborum* compare Verg. G. 3, 53 *crurum*, noting also that Verg. (Wetmore) uses *tenus* with the Gen. twice (also A. 10, 210), but the Abl. 4 times (A. 1, 737; 2, 533; 3, 427; 10, 536), and Hor. *tenus* only once (C. 1, 15, 16, with Abl.). "Limitierendes in": with persons, already in Plaut. (e. g. *Mil.* 673, *Most.* 1116), and in Ter. as early as *And.* 233; compare also Cic. *Pomp.* 58; 61 and *Cat.* 4, 12; *Caes. B. G.* 2, 32, 2; Ovid *Am.* 3, 3, 40.

P. 541 *Clam*: the statements here made need revision; compare Kuehner II, 1, p. 511 and II, 2, p. 636; Riemann-Ernout

Synt. Lat. (1927) p. 210; Schmalz *Antib.* (1905) s. v. Clam; Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 580, and Munro to *Lucr.* I, 476.

P. 556, 150. a Lit.: add Lease A.J.P. XL (1919) pp. 270-277 for a more extended discussion.

P. 561, *Habeo* mit Part. Perf. Pass.: note Servius to Verg. *Aen.* VI, 156: *defixa habens*, and Frontinus *Str.* 3, 5, 1 *exploratum habens*; Livy 21, 43, 6 *congestum possident*; 26, 11, 7 *captum possideret*.

P. 568 Lit.: for a much more comprehensive treatment of *neve* and *neque* see Lease A.J.P. 34, pp. 268 f. and 418 f.; p. 569 *Zusätze*: note also *ut infelicient* Stat. Caec. 114 (R); Quint. 1, 2, 6 *utinam . . . non ipsi perderemus*; 11, 9, 3 *utinam non . . . aut ne quid esset*; Ovid *Met.* 13, 14 *utinam . . . nec umquam venisset*; *Her.* 7, 140 *vellem tetulisset nec fuisset*.

P. 572 α): note that with *forsitan* Ovid uses the Indic. (39) almost as often the Subj. (45); Indic.: Sen. *Suas.* 7, 2; *Contr. Exc.* 5, 6; so also with *forsan* in *Her.* 20, 168; *Tr.* 1, 1, 35, as later Lucan 9, 63; Calpurn. 3, 41; Val. Fl. 2, 151; Stat. *Silv.* 1, 3, 62; 2, 6, 101; 104; 3, 4, 10; Mart. 4, 4, 13; 7, 68, 2; 10, 75, 7; 12, 5, 4; and so, too, with *fortassis* A. A. 1, 665. Compare also *forsitan* with Plpf. Subj. Stat. *Theb.* 6, 52, and *forsan Theb.* 1, 428. Note also *forsitan mutanda* in Fronto p. 130, 2 (N), and Ammian. 16, 7, 4 *forsitan non credenda*; see further Lease A.J.P. 28 pp. 45 f.; 36, p. 80 ftn.; Elmer *Cl. Weekly* 20 (1926) pp. 69 f., Frank H. Fowler *C. W.* 11 (1918) pp. 161 f.; 169 f.

P. 574 *ne . . . nec*: for Cat. 61, 128 read 61, 122 and note that here Cornish (Loeb Cl. 1912) reads *ne . . . neu*; note the earlier usage of Plt. and Ter. (Lease A.J.P. 34 pp. 265 f.; 274 f.; 422 f.), of *ne . . . neve* (*neu*) in Cato and Plt. Note the striking increase of the shorter form *nec* over *neque* with the Imperative and Subj. in principal clauses from 37.0% in Early Latin to 93.8% in Class. Lat. to 99.6% in Silver Lat. i. e. 250 to one (pf. Quint. 1, 4, 13). Compare note to P. 692 *infra*.

P. 575, a) *ut puta*: to Blase *H. G.* p. 250 add Sen. *Ep.* 47, 15; Quint. 7, 1, 14; Quint. Decl. p. 349, 18 (R); Apul. *Phil.* p. 191, 23 (T); Serv. to *Aen.* 12, 519; Mart. Capella 481, 544, 758, 765 (Dick). b): note that "ne mit Imper. Praes." is used 26 times by Vergil, 28 by Ovid; "non beim Imper. Praes.": here but 3 passages are cited (i. e. as in Blase and in

Schmalz), but Kuehner II, 1, p. 203 cites Ovid also (*Her.* 17, 164). Note that in all these examples *non* is rather a word negative than a clause negative, as also in Sen. H. F. 585 and Calpurn. 5, 24 (cited by Clement A.J.P. 21, p. 168) and as in Ovid *Tr.* 5, 5, 63. Note also Cato, PLM 3: *Non suggere*.

P. 579, a): *maior videri*: after Hor. (C. 4, 2, 59) insert Ovid (*Met.* 7, 639; 9, 269); note also Hor. C. 4, 8, 8 *sollers ponere*; Ovid A. A. 1, 358 *apta capi*, *Met.* 7, 380 *servari nescius*. Lit.: add Lease A.J.P. 30, 299. b): note Acc. 290 tempus *revorti* and Ter. *Phorm.* 885 *occasio adimere*. P. 580 A: note Cato *Agr.* 89 *bibere dato*, Fannius *Ann.* VIII frg. (p. 87 P) *biber dari*, Livy 40, 47, 5 *bibere dari*; compare *potui datur*, note to P. 418 a) *supra* and P. 595 B) *infra*. B): note the Inf. with *persuadeo* Nepos 10, 3, 3; *suadeo* Auct. *Her.* 3, 8; *moneo* Sal. *Cat.* 52, 3; *Jug.* 19, 2; and p. 581 C): with *opto* Livy 9, 14, 15; *deterreo* Cic. *Verr.* 1, 24; Bell. Afr. 29, 5; 71, 3; Livy 42, 3, 3; Curt. 10, 1, 2; *recuso*: cf. Lease A.J.P. 30, 307.

P. 585 Acc. c. Inf., with *opto*, possibly Livy 21, 42, 2; *paciscor* 34, 23, 7; *persuadeo* in Livy (2, 2, 7; 3, 21, 7; 5, 45, 1; 10, 28, 3; 33, 32, 3; 42, 42, 5); *precor*: already in Tib. 2, 5, 4; later in Val. Fl. 7, 353 also; *rogo*: already in Cat. 35, 10, Ovid A. A. 1, 453. P. 586 l. 9: *abnuo* already in Lucr. 3, 641; Cic. *Leg.* 1, 40; B: *cerno* already in Plt. and Titin.; cf. Bennett I, p. 372; p. 587 c): *vereor*: Plt. *Mil.* 1285; Livy 2, 7, 9.

P. 590 a) Infin. *indignantis*, according to ALL 6, 101 and Kuehner II, 1, 721 in Livy only once (9, 11, 12): but it is also found in 3, 58, 2; 67, 1; 24, 26, 6.

P. 595 Lit.: add T. Persson "De Orig. ac. vi prim. Gerundii et Gerundivi", 1900; ALL 15, 56 and 351 f. B) Gerundivum nach *do*: in the medicinal sphere, as in Marc. Emp. *do* is used 100 times with the Gdve., with *potui* (Dat.) 70, and with the Infin. only 6 times.

P. 596 b) Genitivendung *-orum* and *-arum*: Draeger II, 830 cites no examples from Caesar, but for *-orum* see B. G. 3, 6, 2; 7, 43, 3; B. C. 1, 4, 2; 15, 4; 2, 42, 5; 3, 24, 1; 31, 4; and *-arum* B. G. 4, 22, 1; in Cic. with *rerum*, as *Att.* 3, 7, 3; *Mur.* 27; 80; *Sest.* 56; 98. Gen. Ger. with Obj. Acc. "mehrfach bei Plt." (as Schmalz): but only 7 times (7 in Ter.); see Bennett I, 448. It is used by Pollio (*Fam.* 10, 33, 5), by

Brutus (*Fam.* 11, 2, 2). Dativ nur bei Plt. (*Epid.* 605) u. ö.: but the "u. ö." is only two more (Bennett I, 449). Der Abl. also used by Livy (*Praef.* 7; 1, 8, 4; 20, 6; 38, 4 etc.). Note Livy 27, 38, 9 eligendi quos vellet, and 28, 19, 2 prodendis qui perfugerant.

P. 599 Akkusativ: say bei Plt. und Ter. etc. Note *circa apparatus visendum* in Liv. 29, 22, 3; *ad rem potiendam* in 27, 15, 9.

P. 601 Lit. add ALL 11, 103 f.; Knapp A.J.P. 32, 29. Zweite Supin: not so frequent in Plt. (19) and Ter. (7) as the Erste Supin, Plt. 130, Ter. 27 (Bennett I, pp. 443 f.). "Aus Cato ist nichts belegt": note, however, Schmalz p. 466, Anmerk. 1 and Kuehner I, 1, p. 724, 3. Note also *risu mirabile* Ambrose *Off.* III, 17, 100.

P. 603 Zusätze α): *quamquam*: note that Quint. should precede Tac. and that this usage is found in poetry also, as Lucan 4, 667; 5, 537 etc.; *quamvis*: earlier in Prop. 1, 8, 37; 15, 13 (fut. part.) and Ovid *Met.* 2, 368; *quasi* with fut. part., also Scr. Hist. Aug. 12, 8, 1; *velut* with perf., earlier in Ov. *Met.* 1, 483 and with fut. in Sen. *Suas.* 6, 16; *forsan* with perf. Lucan 8, 856 and with fut. Stat. *Silv.* 2, 3, 63, *forsitan et* Just. 24, 7, 3, *fortasse* Aug. *Conf.* p. 113, 21 (Kn.); *tamquam* also in Sen. Ep. 46, 1; 59, 14; 70, 17; 98, 5; Dial. 5, 3, 6. Note *ut* with fut. in Sen. *Suas.* 6, 17; Celsus 109, 12; Veg. 3, 1. For the use of these and other particles with the Abl. abs. see Lease A.J.P. 49 (1928) pp. 348 f., and for a discussion of the Pollio passage (Hofmann p. 447 and p. 606 end) see *op. cit.* p. 353; note that in his latter passage the order should be Ovid, Livy, Val. Max. Curt. Sil. Tac. (as *Her.* 18, 112; *Met.* 3, 471; Val. Max. 9, 3, Ext. 3; Sil. 16, 232).

P. 640, b *nec* = *non*: note Livy 1, 25, 11 qui nec procul erat; *necdum* (et non dum) Liv. 42, 34, 12; 43, 1, 3; *nec* (ne . . . quidem): see Lease A.J.P. 30, 302; *nec* . . . *quidem*: used by Cic. *Fam.* 12, 1, 1; Quint. 9, 3, 55; *Decl.* 331, 8; 335, 11 (R). Cf. Gudeman *Dial.* p. 288.

P. 648 -*ne*: note that Sen. phil. regularly omits -*ne* (in prose used only twice (*Dial.* 13, 12, 6; *Clem.* 1, 9, 10), but in poetry he attaches it 30 times), and note that Sen. rhet. does not use *nonne* at all (*non* simply: at least 10 times). Hor., however, uses it only 4 times (Cooper), 3 of these being in the formula

Nonne vides ut, but on the contrary Sen. phil. always uses *non vides* (exc. *Ep.* 87, 20).

P. 649 Zusatz, *nonne*: the exception in early Lat. (Bennett I, p. 472 citing but 31 examples, of which 15 are in Plt., 12 in Ter., and all before a vowel, exc. 3 in Ter. (*And.* 239, 747, 869)); *numnam*: more exactly "nur Plt. und Ter." (see Bennett p. 474); *numne*: also found in (Auson.) p. 430, 5 (P); Boethius *Herm. Sec.* p. 46 (M). Note also that the 3 examples in Prud. are all read by I. Bergman (*Prud.* 1926) and are corroborated by *Glossemata de Prud.* (Burnham 1905, p. 92).

P. 655 *Namque* bei Dichtern: appears already in Acc. Frg. 180 (R); see also Lease A.J.P. 30, 302.

P. 656, line 16: should say: *sehr selten an a*: note its use in Ovid *Her.* 21, 180; *Met.* 3, 631; note *eque* Verg. *Ecl.* 7, 13; Ovid *Met.* 5, 634; *adque* Val. Max. 3, 7, 3. Zusätze a), "s. Weissenborn zu Liv. 1, 55, 6": but here W. merely cites the passages cited by Draeger H. S. II, p. 80, omitting 29, 21, 4, and both D. and W. omit 26, 33, 13. P. 657 *hodieque* s. Schmalz *Antib.* I, 654: see, however, Lease A.J.P. 30, p. 48. Note also its use in Sen. *Contr.* 1, 1, 15; Val. Max. 7, 8, 10; Vell. 2, 61, 3; 98, 1; Suet. *Tib.* 14, 3; *De Poet.* 3; *Vir.* III, 104; Lud. Hist. p. 341 (R); Plac. to Stat. *Theb.* 12, 64; and Script. Hist. Aug. (14 times: 1, 3, 6; 3, 1, 9; 4, 12, 12 etc.).

P. 659 a) *atque non*: but see also Lease A.J.P. 30 (1909) for omissions in the Thes. Note also Gell. 17, 21, 46, where *non* modifies *nimium*, as in Hor. C. 2, 18, 40, *vocatus*.

P. 663 *nec . . . neve* bei Dichtern: but also in prose, as Apul. *Met.* 7, 5 (p. 158, 8 Helm), and Livy 25, 9, 4: *monuit irent nec . . . neu facerent* ("Verg." (cited by Schmalz p. 498 and Kuehner II, 1, 194) should not be included, as latest texts (G. 3, 435) read *ne . . . neu* (cf. 3, 80; 2, 253)); and note that Petron. 5 has *nec . . . nec . . . neve*, Tib. 1, 1, 38 has *neu . . . nec*, Sil. 2, 700 has *audite neu . . . nec*; see Lease A.J.P. 34 (1913) pp. 264 and 273. Note that "Friedländer z. St." needs revision: 6, 282 has *ut faceres tu nec non ego possem*; 450: *non habeat . . . nec sciat . . . et non*; 14, 201 should read: *pares nec . . . subeant neu credas*.

P. 664 *interdum . . . interdum*: also in Celsus (3, 24; 4, 4; 12; 5, 28, passages omitted by ALL 2, 244).

P. 670 *verum enim vero*: after Sall. (line 6) insert Liv.

(uses it 6 times; see Draeger 2, 130, H. J. Mueller to 4, 4, 9, Luterbacher to 29, 8, 7, adding 39, 4, 8).

P. 679 *Namque* vor Konsonanten: also in Naev. (Tr. frg. 41 R), in Enn.: also in *Ann.* 575 and *Var.* 7; and Caec. Frg. 278 R. (Note that Kuehner II, 2, 113 "an zweiter Stelle" cites 5 for Vergil adding thereto "u. ö.": there are only 3 more (A. 8, 497; 10, 401; 815), and for Prop. cites 2, omitting 2, 21, 12; see Lease A.J.P. 30 (1909), 302; 36 (1915), 83 f.). Note, too, that while "vor allem seit Verg." is true for *namque* in poetry (as Verg. 66, Hor. 16, Prop. 9), relatively to the number of pages of text Nepos (with 69) uses it 3 times as often. And whereas Nepos always uses *namque* 1st (before *cons.* 6), Verg. places it 1st 53 times, 2nd 13; Hor. 1st 15, 2nd 1 (S. 1, 6, 57); Prop. 1st 6, 2nd 3; Tac. 1st 50, 2nd 4 (*Ann.* 1, 5; 2, 43; 4, 21; *Dial.* 19); correct *Antibarbarus* (1907) II, 120.

P. 681 *Etenim*: though used 21 times by Lucr. was used only 6 times by Hor., once by Verg., once by Prop., twice by Nepos, 3 times by Vell. Note, too, that of the 17 postpositive in Lucr. all are *quippe etenim* (exc. 3, 288; 5, 632); in Hor.: always postpos. exc. Sat. 2, 7, 37, and once in Parenthesis (S. 1, 7, 10); Verg.: A. 7, 390 1st; Prop.: 2, 7, 17 2nd; Nepos 8, 2, 2; 18, 3, 4 1st; Vell.: 2, 102 (parenth.); 121, 1; 127, 1, all 1st.

P. 683 *Igitur*: note also that *igitur* was used only 3 times by Verg. (Wetmore), only 6 times by Hor. (Cooper), and only in his Satires, and only 4 times by Prop., and that in these three poets it is only postpositive, that in the total 13 all are in questions exc. Verg. *Ecl.* 7, 18; Hor. S. 2, 3, 152; Prop. 1, 8, 41 (also used in 2, 6, 37; 8, 17; 9, 17).

P. 686 *Nec non et*: this strange combination⁴ was introduced by Vergil (using it 16 times), then taken up by Ovid (4), Columella (1), Lucan (3), Plin. mai. (36), Statius (3), Sil. (6), Quint. (1), Juv. (3), Suet. (4), Florus (2), Justin (4), Apul. (3), Commodianus (3), Ausonius (1), Prudentius (8), Claudianus (4), Macrobian (4), Marc. Emp. (21), Orosius Adv. Pag. (1), and in Eccles. and Juristic Latin. This formula

⁴ See especially Kübler ALL 8, 181, 297, 448 (*Aen.* 1, 786 cited for 1, 748), and Lease ALL 10, 390; A.J.P. 21, 452; 30, 302; 38, 80 and Class. Rev. 13, 130.

reaches its climax in Plin. mai. and Marc. Emp., probably owing to Vergil's ⁵ influence.

Nec non etiam: introduced by Varro R. R. 1, 1, 6 (v. l. et); 2, 1, 22; 10, 9 (for which Kübler cites 23, 10, 9); 3, 16, 26, as also *neque non etiam* R. R. 3, 3, 4; L. L. 10, 35, followed by Verg. *Geo.* 2, 413 and much later by Ael. Spart. 9. 8 and by Capella (Dick) 1, 17; 48.

P. 689 *sino*: after Plt. insert Ter., Cato, Caec. (noted by Bennett 1, 235).

P. 690 *prohibeo ne* is, however, used only 4 times by Livy (M. Mueller to 1, 39, 5 and H. J. M. to 24, 43, 4); so, too, *impedio ne*: only 4 times in Livy (Draeger II, 294).

P. 691. Note that in Plt. and Ter. (Bennett 1, 254) *ut* is used twice as often (8) after *metuo* as *ne non* (4), and that with *vereor* only *ut* is used (Ter.: 4). In Cicero, however, *vereor* is followed 25 times by *ne non*, by *ut* only 17 (i. e. positive: *ne non* 16 (Or. 2, Phil. 3, Ep. 9, Rhet. 2), *ut* 14 (Or. 5, Phil. 0, Ep. 8, Rhet. 1); negative: *ne non* 9 (Or. 4, Phil. 1, Ep. 4, Rhet. 0), *ut* 3 (Or. 2, Phil. 1)); to Brinker *N. Jahrb.* 1896, p. 367 (cited by Schmalz *Antib.* (1907)) add for *ne non* positive, Att. 7, 12, 2; negative, Fam. 11, 28, 8; for *ut* positive, Att. 8, 11B, 1 and to the 2 examples of *ne non* with *timeo* pos., Cael. 66; and note that with *metuo* only *ne non* is used, the most frequent negative with *vereor*, also that *vereor ne nihil* is used in Att. 14, 12, 1; 16, 3; 22, 1 (Kuehner (1914) II, 252 omits these two, and for *ne non* cites but one in Att., p. 253: add 2, 19, 3; 13, 9, 2; 48, 1; 15, 3, and for *ut*: 7, 17, 2; 6, 17; 8, 11 B. 1).

P. 692, line 13, "oben a. O.": should say S. 574; p. 693, line 8, "Lease Class. Ph. 3, 302 ff.": but here, as Schmalz p. 515 noted, only Livy's usage is discussed. Accordingly cite

⁵ See Verg. *G.* 1, 212 etc. (see Wetmore); Ovid *Met.* 1, 613; 7, 432; 8, 749; 15, 427; Col. R. R. 8, 156; Lucan 3, 516; 7, 56; 10, 486; Stat. *Ach.* 1, 923; Th. 2, 371; 6, 442; Sil. 2, 432; 7, 86; 9, 66; 11, 111; 225; 277; Quint. 9, 4, 25; Juv. 3, 204; 9, 88; 10, 51; Suet. *Cal.* 40; *Vesp.* 8; *Tit.* 5; *Dom.* 14; Auson. *Ecl.* 18, 4; Flor. 2, 3, 2; 3, 5, 29; Apul. (Helm) *Met.* 200, 4; 282, 6; *Flor.* 22, 3; Prud. (Lease Prud. p. 53); Claud. *Epith. Hon.* 159; *Bell. Goth.* 558; *Rapt. Pros.* 1, 266; 3, 14; Macrobian 1, 19, 2; 4, 6, 10; 6, 4, 23; 7, 2, 6; Oros. 5, 10, 7.

instead Lease A.J.P. 34 (1913) pp. 256-275; 418-436, as being later and much more extensive in its scope. "*Ut neque . . . neque* seltener *ut neve . . . neve*, C. F. W. Müller zu Cic. off. S. 31. 83": in general *ut neque-neque* is far more frequently used (175 times) than *ut neve-neve* (4 times), and in Cicero, instead of being used '3 times as often' (Müller p. 83) is used 13 times as often (52 to 4)! Note that in Early Latin in Final Clauses there is little choice (5 and 7), but in Class. Lat. *ut-neve* is used much oftener (40 to 27), and in Silver Lat. there is again not much difference (*ut-neque*: 26, *ut-neve*: 23); and note that there is an increase of *ut-nec* over *ut-neque*: Early Lat. represented by 18%, Cl. Lat. by 35.7%, Silver Lat. by 76.7%! Compare the usage in Principal Clauses, note to P. 574 *supra*.

P. 696 Indirekte Fragen: note that Cicero uses *Haud scio an* 46 times (Or. 12, Ph. 23, Rh. 5, Ep. 6), *haud sciam an* 6 times (Ph. 2, Rh. 4), *nescio an* 15 (Or. 4, Ph. 4, Rh. 2, Ep. 5; also Dolabella Fam. 9, 9, 2; Caecina Fam. 6, 7, 3), *haud sciam an* being used in De Or. 1, 255; 2, 18; 72; 209. Note also that none of these formulae is used by Verg., and Hor. uses only *nescio an* (Sat. 2, 3, 83); that Cicero uses *haud scio an* with the Plpf. Subj. in Brut. 151; Plin. mai. 8, 167 uses it with the Abl. Abs. (compare *nescio an oculis visuris* in Plin. min. 7, 19, 4 and modifying *difficiliorem* in Sen. Ep. 108, 16, and similar uses of *forsitan*, *quamvis*, *licet* etc.).

P. 698, Paragraph two, end: "Weissenborn zu 9, 23, 4": a better reference is Friedersdorff zu 27, 47, 3 (p. 97), showing that the rarest is *-ne* (9), but not used in the 4th Decade. *Utrumne . . . an*: in Hor. found earlier in Sat. 2, 3, 251. Insert after Curt.: Col. (11, 1, 5), after Mart.: Gell. (17, 7, 3) and Quint. Decl. (261 (p. 70, 4)).

P. 702 Perf. for Impf. "seit Liv.": Woelfflin-Lut. (1883) to 23, 19, 17 cites Caes. B. G. 1, 51, 1.

P. 713 *Utpote qui*: note also Mil. Gl. 530 and Brix⁴ *ad loc.*, and to the one occurrence of the Ind. in Val. Max. cited by Draeger II, p. 536 add 7, 8, 1. *Quippe qui* with the Ind.: also in Ter. H. T. 538, also "am Versschluss". Note that Cic. uses *quippe qui* 29 times (Or. 2, Ph. 21, De Or. 3, 74, Ep. 5), and that Apul. (Ascl. 15 and 37) also uses the Subj. *Ut qui* "erst seit Cic. Phil. 9, 17 dann Liv. 7, 14, 6": but Cic. uses it ear-

lier in *Fam.* 5, 18, 2 and Livy has four earlier (cited by Draeger p. 537); and, too, after Vell. should be inserted Plin. mai. (15, 45; 16, 51; 25, 85 (for which Draeger cites 15, 85)), all with the Subj. Particularly noteworthy is Ovid *Ibis* 371 f., where *ut qui* is used 10 times with the Ind., and later in 453, 484, 495, 498. *Ut ubi* Liv. 38, 21, 14: but earlier in 26, 46, 2 (cited by Dr. p. 537, for which Kuehner II, 2, p. 293 cites 6, 46, 2); for "Sen." read Sen. phil. (as *D.* 3, 11, 3). See Lease A.J.P. 20, 63; 30, 309; 36, 84 and Steele 27, pp. 56 f. and compare notes to P. 752 *infra*.

P. 722 *Utpote quod*: also in Plt. *Bacch.* 511; *ob hoc*: in Livy 25, 37, 16 etc.; *ob haec*: 8, 23, 8; 28, 39, 13; *ob id*: 25, 13, 7; *ob ea*: 40, 1, 5; *ob quae*: 5, 31, 6.

P. 724 *Praeterquam quod*: earlier in Ter. *And.* 753; "oft Cic. Liv.": much more appropriate for Liv. (60) than Cic. (10): Or. 2, Ph. 3, Rh. 1 (Inv. 2, 62), Ep. 4. *Superquam quod* "22, 3, 14 al.": but "al." means only 27, 20, 10 (Friedersdorff (1881) *ad loc.* and Draeger II, p. 233).

P. 725 *Quia*: "Hor. nur 3mal in carm.": but all in Bk. IV (32 in Sat. and Epist.); not so frequent as *quod* (123), but oftener than *quoniam* (4): from Cooper *op. cit.* Livy shows a remarkable preference for *quia* (744); *quod* (714) follows, then *quoniam* (108), according to Steele A.J.P. 27, 57.

P. 727 b) *non quia*: found earlier in Hor. *Sat.* 1, 6, 1 (elsewhere, *Ep.* 2, 1, 76; *nec quia Ep.* 1, 8, 6).

P. 732 *Supra quam*: in Cic. also found in Top. 39 (cited by Kuehner II, 2, 460) and N. D. 2, 136 (cited by Draeger II, p. 649). Note also that Verg. shows a slight preference for *haud aliter* (8) over *non aliter* (7), and for *haud secus* (8) over *non secus* (5); that Verg. says *non aliter quam* (*Aen.* 4, 669), but Ovid says *haud aliter quam* (*Met.* 8, 762; 11, 330); that Ovid says *non aliter quam cum* (*Met.* 3, 373; 4, 348; 6, 516; *Fast.* 2, 209) but *haud a. q. cum* (*Met.* 10, 594; 15, 553: cf. Liv. 1, 31, 2); that *haud secus ac* appears in Verg. *Aen.* 3, 236; 11, 456; Ovid *Met.* 9, 40, but *haud secus quam* in Ovid *Met.* 12, 102 a favorite collocation in Livy (28). Cf. *nec secus quam* 5, 43, 8; 28, 3, 12; see Friedersdorff Liv. 28, p. 118, but for 3, 28, 2 read 3, 23, 2; for 22, 53, 10 read 22, 53, 13; for 28, 15, 16 read 28, 15, 6; for 39, 32, 10 read 39, 31,

10; for 42, 49, 2 read 42, 59, 2), but *non secus ac* in Verg. Geo. 3, 346; Aen. 8, 391; 12, 756, Hor. A. P. 149.

P. 735: note, however, that Vergil (Wetmore) uses the "metrisch unbequem" *antequam* oftener (16) than *priusquam* (12), including 4 of each in the *Carm. Min.*, with the component parts always in different lines, except: *ante . . . quam* Cul. 135; *prius . . . quam* Geo. 1, 50; Aen. 1, 192; 11, 809; Dirae 7; and *prius quam* G. 3, 468; A. 1, 472; 6, 328; that Hor. uses *antequam* twice (to the *Thes. L. L.* add Sat. 2, 3, 135), *priusquam* once (Ep. 5, 79 f.); Catull. has *prius . . . quam* 64, 91; 189; Prop. uses *a . . . q.* 2, 12, 11 and *p . . . q.* 2, 25, 6; that Vell. uses *antequam* but once and *priusquam* but once (in 1, 7, 3; 2, 42, 3), and prefers *ante . . . quam* (23 times) to *prius . . . quam* (once: 1, 10, 2); that a similar preference is shown by Celsus: 13 to 1 (7, 2), Sen. *Dial.*, *Ep.*: 56-5, Plin. *min.* 17-3, and in contrast thereto stands Marc. Emp. 13-10; Quint. 13-12; Veget. 11-10 and Macrobian 10-10. Note also that in Florus as in Verg. neither conjunction appears as one word, that the *Infin.* is used with them in Vell. 2, 24, 4; 129, 3 and Florus 4, 2, 22; 63, and the Imperative in Sen. *Ep.* 17, 8. (Perf. Ind.: to the 14 cited for Plt. by Bennett add 5 (Ep. 46; Mo. 221; Po. 416; Rud. 1131; 1168), to the 2 cited for Ter. add 3 (And. 968; Hec. 541; 744); and Fut. Perf.: to Kuehner II, 2, 369 add Cic. Att. 14, 9, 6; 16, 15, 6). Furthermore, note *ante . . . quam* with Pres. Part. in Livy 3, 51, 13; 7, 35, 5; 21, 14, 4; 24, 18, 12; 42, 7, 8 and *prius . . . quam*: 5, 7, 7; 8, 14, 6 and Florus 4, 12, 37, and for the use of these conjunctions with the Abl. Abs. see Lease A.J.P. 49, p. 350, adding thereto Plin. *mai.* 8, 144 (*priusquam*). *Posteaquam*: read Cic. *Fam.* 3, 6, 2; *antequam* nur bei Liv.: see Cic. *Dei.* 30; *Fam.* 3, 6, 2 (cited by Kuehner p. 366) parts separated.

P. 737 *Etsi*, "Quint., der etsi meidet": a statement found in numerous quarters, probably originally due to the fact that Bonnell *Lex. Quint.* (1834) omits *etsi*. However, Quint. uses *etsi* at least 8 times, as was first pointed out by the writer in C. R. 13 (1899) p. 130 and later in A.J.P. XX (1899), p. 63 and XXI (1901) p. 454. Accordingly note: *etiamsi*, used 30 times, *etsi* 8, *tametsi* 5. Moreover, Hofmann on p. 781 has: "Quint. (nur 5mal, s. Gabler 82)". Note that Claudianus

(Platnauer) also does not use *quamquam* (concessive) at all (unless *In Ruf.* 2, 252 (c. subj.) be so interpreted) over against *quamvis* (25) and *licet* (15). See also Lease A.J.P. 30, 306 and note *quamquam dictus* in Hor. C. 2, 19, 25; compare my note to P. 603 *supra*. *Quamquam* corrective ('and yet'): insert Verg. *Aen.* 5, 195; 11, 415; Hor. *Serm.* 1, 1, 24; 2, 2, 41 and add its use in Claud. *In Ruf.* 2, 512; *Cons. Stil.* II, 293; *Bell. Goth.* 104.

P. 738 *Quamvis* with the Indicative: in Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 84 (Fairclough *Virg.* (1916)); in Ovid oftener with Ind. (56) than Subj. (50), and so, too, in Celsus with Ind. 25 times to Subj. 6, but Stat. has the Ind. but 4 times (*Silv.* 3, 2, 52; *Th.* 4, 741; 6, 272; 7, 250); Prop. and Suet., only 3 each (1, 18, 13; 2, 24, 38; 3, 19, 30; *Tib.* 68, 4; *Vesp.* 15; *Dom.* 19, 2); see Lease A.J.P. 30, 306 also. Zusatz b) *Licet*: this milder, gracious concessive is expanded into *licebit*: Hor. Sat. 2, 2, 59; Ep. 15, 19; Ovid *Am.* 2, 11, 53; *Met.* 2, 58; 8, 755; *Trist.* 5, 14, 3; Sen. Ep. 28, 4; Lucan, 7, 855 as in Martial 8, 21, 11 etc.; at foot of page say Tib. 1, 7, 40 or 2, 4, 45, but not 3, 19, 13, and say *vor allem* Mart. (54), Ovid (46), Juv. (21). Note that *licet* also is used with the Plpf. Subj. by Lact. Plac. to *Theb.* 3, 118 (cf. *quamvis* in Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 50, by Serv. to *Aen.* 3, 279; 8, 646; Macrob. 1, 7, 4; and with the Indic. also, as in Ammian. 16, 10, 11; 18, 1, 3; 19, 3, 3 etc. and Macrob. 1, 11, 42. Of the Augustan poets *licet* (conj.) is most frequently used by Ovid (46), Prop. (16), Verg. (3: A. 6, 802; 11, 348; 440); Hor. (3: S. 1, 2, 81; C. 3, 24, 3; Ep. 4, 5), and Tib. (3: 1, 2, 67; 7, 42; 2, 4, 45; also 3, 9, 17; 19, 13; Pan. Mess. 190). Comparing these three conjunctions: note Sen. *Epist.* *quamquam*: 5; *quamvis*: 40; *licet*: 37; but Quint., *Quamquam*: 96; *quamvis*: 24; *licet*: 20; Claudianus, *quamquam*: 2; *quamvis*: 25; *licet*: 15; Marc. Emp., *quamquam*: 2; *quamvis*: 16; *licet*: 3. See also Lease A.J.P. 36 (1915) p. 84, and for these conjunctions with the Abl. Abs., 49 (1928) pp. 349 f.

P. 744 c) *Dum* = 'bis': used more often by Verg. (8: impf. subj., A. 1, 5; 2, 136; 10, 800) than by Hor. (1: S. 1, 4, 20 pr. subj.); 'so long as': in Verg. only twice (E. 6, 76; A. 9, 448, fut. ind.), in Hor. 3 times (S. 1, 1, 52 pr. subj.; 4, 118 pr. ind.; Ep. 15, 7 impf. subj.), also Lucr. 1, 434; Catull.

55, 22; 114, 5 and 6; and p. 745 d) *dum* = *dummodo*: used once by Verg. (A. 11, 792), 4 times by Hor. (S. 1, 6, 8; C. 1, 16, 26; 3, 3, 7; Ep. 2, 2, 127); and also in Lucr. 1, 435; *dum ne* "mehrfach Hor.": but only twice, S. 1, 1, 40; 2, 3, 31 (Draeger II, 76 cites none, Kuehner II, 2, 447 cites one), and also used by Ovid *Her.* 3, 81; *Met.* 10, 318; Livy 2, 41, 7; 44, 45, 4; *dum tamen*: found earlier in Lucr. 2, 657; *modo ne*: also Ovid *Met.* 13, 135; Livy 9, 34, 15 etc.; *tantum ne*: already in Ovid *Am.* 3, 8, 59 (cited by Draeger II, p. 63).

P. 752 *Kausales cum* mit Ind.: already appears in Gellius, as 2, 29, 1; see Knapp A.J.P. 32, 29. Note that Cicero prefers *quippe cum* (13: Or. 2, Ph. 9, Att. 10, 3 a, 1; Brut. 69) to *utpote cum* (3: Att. 5, 8, 1; 7, 13, 3; 16, 11, 2), and so, too, does Florus (19-0). *Quippe cum* Liv. 4, 24, 8 al.: Kuehner II, 2, 347 cites but two occurrences, the above and 4, 57, 10 and adds "u. ö.", but there are only two more: 26, 39, 9; 28, 45, 4; see Steele A.J.P. 27, p. 57.

P. 753 *Quoniam*: used by Livy 108 times (Ind. 46, Subj. 62: either formal or informal *O. O.* (Steele pp. 54 f.)), and whereas Verg. uses *quoniam* 15 times (Wetmore) Hor. uses it only 3 times and only in the Satires (Cooper).

P. 754 *Donec*: Verg. uses *donec* 18 times (ALL 11, 336: "im ganzen an 8 St."!), *quoad*, not at all; Hor.: 17 times, *quoad* once (S. 2, 3, 91). *Donec* 'bis' with Fut. I in Verg. only Aen. 1, 273, in Hor. only C. 3, 6, 2; Fut. II, Verg. only A. 2, 719, in Hor. only S. 1, 5, 96. Prud. uses *donec* 'until' 7 times, 'as long as' once (Lease Prud. p. 40); Marc. Emp. greatly prefers *donec* (120) to *dum* (25), the former always with the pres. subj., the latter always with the pres. ind. Lit.: add ALL 15, 418 f., AJP 31, 268.

P. 758, Temporal *ut*: relatively most frequent in Curt., Petron., and Suet. (Steele A.J.P. 31, 273); p. 759 *ut primum* bei Hirt. und Sall. nur je 2mal": as Jones cites only one of each, the others ought to be cited; "häufig bei Suet. Apul.": but in Suet. *ut. pr.* 5, *cum pr.* 5, *ubi pr.* 0 and in Apul. *ut. pr.* 11, *cum pr.* 12, *ubi pr.* 3; "seltener als *cum pr.* und *ubi pr.* bei Sen. rhet. Vell.": but Sen. rhet. has *ut pr.* 2 times, *ubi pr.* and *cum pr.* only once each, and Vell. uses only *ut primum* (2), which, it may be noted, is the only one of these formulae used

by Plin. min. (9): statements based on Jones ALL 14, 236 f., referred to. Compare note to P. 767 *infra*.

P. 762 *ut ne*: used, however, by Livy 21, 49, 8; 34, 17, 8; 4, 12, 4, and to Lit. add: Cl. Weekly 10, 178 f.; 185 f.; 11, 161 f.; 169 f.

P. 763: note Auct. Her. 4, 41 *non erit ut*, and that Livy uses not only *in eo ut* (2, 17, 5) but *ab eo ut* (25, 6, 11), *cum eo ut* (8, 12, 16), and *pro eo ut* (9, 8, 15); *necesse est ut*: also in Sen. Suas. 6, 10; see further Lease A.J.P. 30, 303. Note also *licet ut* in Prud. Apoth. 410: *non licet ut rapias*.

P. 764 Concessive *ut*: after Liv. add Sen. phil. (*Ep.* 19, 3; 65, 14 etc.). Note also *ut . . . sic* Ovid Trist. 1, 9, 62; 2, 65; *ut . . . tamen* Ov. Pont. 3, 4, 79.

P. 767 *Ubi primum* selten bei Augusteern: "selten" much too mild, as Verg. and Ovid use this formula but once each, and Hor. avoids it entirely; *ubi primum* vor allem Liv.: certainly incorrect relatively to the use of *cum primum* and *ut primum*; measured in this way *ubi primum* occurs most frequently in Gellius (1: 100%) and Sallust (81.8%), followed by Justin (80%) and Tacitus (66.5%), a significant preference. *Cum primum*, used most often by Sen. phil. (72.2%), Cic. (54.8%), Livy (29.8%); *ut primum*, preferred by Cic. (45.2%), less so by Sen. phil. (27.8%) and by Livy (14.1%), using as a basis for comparison Jones *op. cit.* Note also that in Nepos *cum primum* = 100% and that in Hor., Vell., and Plin. min. *ut primum* = 100%. Compare the note to P. 758 *supra*.

P. 768: Note that Cicero in his Letters uses *quoad* 36 times, but *donec* not at all; on the other hand, Pliny in his Letters uses *quoad* but twice (1, 12, 5; 3, 1, 11, and in the sense of 'so long as') but *donec* 7 times.

P. 773 *Si c. Fut. I* oder *II*—Perf. log. ist häufig bei Plt. und Ter.: but Bennett cites only 4 in Plt. and 6 in Ter.; *si c. Fut. II*—Praes.: after Plt. cite Ter. and Cato; see Bennett I, p. 73.

P. 778 *nisi si* oft im Altlatein: but Bennett cites only 17, and considering the scope "oft" is hardly appropriate. Note also that Plt. uses *ni* 85 times, *nisi si* 11; Ter., *ni* 18, *nisi si* 6, and that in these writers *ni* is used about as often with the Subj. (50) as with the Ind. (53), but *nisi si* is followed by the Ind. 16 times, with the Subj. once. Note also Rhet. Her. 4, 4, 6: *nisi etiam, si . . . , putaretis*; that *nisi si* is used 8 times

by Ovid (*Her.* 4, 117; 17, 151; 21, 237; *Met.* 5, 20; 615; [10, 201]; 14, 177; 561; by Sen. *Contr.* 9, 2, 24; 10, 5, 4 and Sen. *Dial.* 8, 3, 2 *bis*; 9, 13, 2 *ter*; *Ep.* 74, 34; *Ben.* 2, 15, 1; 4, 35, 1 (supplementary to Kuehner II, 2, 417 also).

P. 780 *Etsi*: read and defended by Fairclough (1916) Verg. *Aen.* 2, 583; "häufig schon bei Plt.": "häufig" scarcely appropriate in view of the extensive scope of Plautus (Bennett citing only 19 occurrences; see also Lodge *Lex. Plaut.*); "etwas häufiger Catull Prop.": but used only twice by Cat. (65, 1; 72, 5), only twice by Prop. (2, 2, 16; 19, 1). After Colum. insert Curt. (4, 13, 1; 8, 11, 25; 9, 6, 10); Quint.: should say: nur 8mal (see note to P. 737 *supra*).

P. 781 *Tamenetsi* add also Pacuv. 46 (R), Lucil. 181, 916; Catull. 68, 136.

P. 784 *Ac si*: note that Verg. uses *non secus ac si* twice (A. 8, 243; 10, 272) and *haud secus ac si* once (A. 12, 124). Compare note to P. 732 *supra*. *Perinde ac* for *perinde ac si*: a much better treatment is given by M. Mueller II, p. 159 (to which add 2, 58, 1): Livy uses *perinde ac si* 13 times but *perinde ac* 7 times. Note also *perinde ac motus* 9, 14, 2 (for p. a. *motus esset*) and compare note to P. 603 *supra*. *Quin* interrogative: much more frequent in Plt. than Bennett's lists (pp. 24 f., 130, 183) would indicate i. e. Plt. instead of using it 99 times uses it 133 times (to Bennett p. 130 imp. ind. add Truc. 506; with the pf. ind. note: Merc. 189, 622; Ps. 501; Rud. 841, 861; St. 576; Trin. 291; p. 183 with pr. subj. add: Rud. 767, 534); note also pr. ind. in Sall. *Cat.* 20, 14; Vell. 2, 7, 2 and the interesting combination, Plt. *Asin.* 254: *Quin reice et amove atque recipis*? Note also *Quin* and Imperat. in Stat. *Th.* 5, 140 and *Quin potius* in Macr. 7, 13, 18.

P. 785 *Quin et (iam)* s. Rothstein zu Prop. 2, 34, 93: to Verg. A. 7, 750 add: 6, 735; 777; 11, 130; to Hor. Od. 1, 10, 13 add: 2, 13, 37; 3, 11, 21. Note also that Verg. uses *quin etiam* 9 times, *quin et* 4, but *quin* 10; Hor., *quin etiam* 3, *quin et* 3, but *quin* 8; see further Lease A.J.P. 30, 307.

P. 788: note that Cic. uses *quominus* 103 times (Rh. 5, Or. 37, Ph. 27, Ep. 34), but *quin* 358 times (Rh. 19, Or. 167, Ph. 87, Ep. 85). Note also Prud. *Per.* 14, 13 *renisam quo minus . . . desereret*.

P. 791: *Verbalia auf -tio*: note the contrasts, Plt. 85, Ter.

only 22, but Verg. 6, Prud. 53 and Abstr. auf *-tudo*: Plt. 23, Ter. 9, but Verg. 0 and Prud. 2 (Lease *Prud.* p. 43).

P. 793: note Liv. Andr. *Trg.* frg. 13 (R): *maiestas mea* procat; in line 13 read Prud. *Peristeph.* 13, 65; and note these contrasts in the use of *-tor* and *-trix*: Verg. has 61, but Prud. has 149, and of *-trix* Verg. has 11, but Prud. 29 (Lease *Prud.* p. 46 (quoted by Schmalz p. 607)).

P. 796 Die clausula heroica: cf Kuehner II, 2, 624 and notes thereto: Lease A.J.P. 36 (1915) pp. 85 f., and to the lists of Complete Hexameters in Prose: to the 2 in Cic. add Leg. Agr. 2, 46; Fam. 15, 14, 3; to the 5 in Livy add 4, 5, 4; 26, 41, 13; 30, 30, 4; 42, 16, 4; 44, 31, 8; to the 2 in Sen. rhet. add Contr. 2, 3, 11, and Val. Max. 5, 10, 3: cessato officio partiri non potuisset. In regard to the use of *-ere* and *-erunt* in general and in Livy in particular see Lease A.J.P. XXIV pp. 408-422. To the "Lit." add: Clark *Fontes Prosae Numerosae* (Oxford, 1909); Shipley "Heroic Clausulae in Cicero and Quintilian", *Cl. Phil.* VI (1910) pp. 410 f.

P. 803 Lit.: for Quintilian's use of Alliteration see Lease A.J.P. 21, pp. 453 f.

P. 817, near end, Neologismen, etwas nüchterner ist Catull: note, however, Norden (Einl. d. Alt. (1910) p. 477): "Immerhin hat aber Catull ungewöhnlich viele ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, so viel wie kein anderer uns erhaltener lateinischer Dichter".

P. 835, middle: note that Plt. uses over 600 "Deminutiva," Ter. over 120 (Stolz H. Gr. I (1894) p. 574), but Verg. uses only 30, and later Prud. 55 (all classical exc. 3, and 15 being in Verg., 16 in Juvenal); see Lease *Prud.* p. 47.

P. 848, Lit.: add E. S. McCartney "Zeugma in Vergil's Aeneid and in English," *Phil. Quart.* VIII (1929) 79 f.; E. Adelaide Hahn "A Study of Zeugma in Virgil" (read at A. Ph. Assn., Dec. 27, 1928: to be published in the *Class. Journal*). Die Figura ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. Lit.: for its use in Horace see J. C. M. Grimm, Diss., Univ. Pennsylvania, 1928.

The following typographical errors are to be noted:

A, *Misprints*:

P. 348. 18: read New York; 358, 135: read Johns Hopkins; 379, l. 1: read Iaccho; 568, Lit. l. 9: read origin; 577, last line: read propinasse; 617 b) near end: read Ullman, and Iowa;

635 B, l. 19 (536 l. 3): read McCartney; 657 Lit. end (and p. 683, *igitur*, near end): read McKinlay; 688 Lit. l. 6: read George Dwight Kellogg; 693, l. 5: read div. in Caec., l. 6: read ne . . . neve . . . neve. 738 l. 24, read perveneras; 743 l. 14; b) is omitted; 834 Triplikation, l. 3: read huat hauat huat.

B, Errors in Citation:

P. 6 near end: read vgl. § 35; 364, 3 near end: read vgl. § 19, b; 373 near end: § 31, d; 374 e) end: read II, 268, 270; 375 a) line 11: read § 24; e): read § 190 d; f): read § 60, e; 389 l. 14: read § 19, a) β; 406, l. 13: read Jug. 85, 45; 452 d) l. 4: read § 17, b, and near end: read § 17, b; 659 Lit.: read § 229; 689 h) β: read § 301, b; 690, 266 l. 12: read § 322; 700 l. 5: read § 301 and § 305; 721, 286 l. 10: read Capt. 350; 734 last line: read Steele (for Lease); 746, 307, l. 2: read § 313 and 747 l. 3 read § 308 a; 754 Zus.: read ALL 5, 569; and p. 755: read ALL 11, 335; 763, 324, l. 9: read § 322 b; 788, l. 12: read § 216 e.

But the book as a whole cannot be too highly praised. In the brief compass of scarcely more than 600 pages the Editor has covered in a masterly way an enormously large field and has given us much of great value and importance.

EMORY B. LEASE.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

LITERARY IMITATION IN THE THEOGNIDEA

There are found in the Theognidea many verses that resemble, more or less closely, certain passages which are likewise found in poets earlier than Theognis. The presence of such verses has been explained in several different ways. Those who believe that the Theognidea represent an anthology, gathered from various writers earlier and later than Theognis, explain these verses by saying that some later collector or reviser, who is responsible for the poems in their present form, simply culled from Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Solon, and perhaps others, whatever suited his particular purpose. Writers who regard the Theognidea as a collection made particularly for purposes of the banquet explain many of the verses as *scolia*, and trace them back to the original authors on the principle that such *scolia* were frequently quotations of earlier writers made in somewhat altered form. Those who regard the Theognidea as a collection made for school purposes think that verses which resemble other poets slipped into the original text of Theognis as the result of their being written on the margins of school-books in order to compare them with the verses of Theognis himself. Our present text, therefore, is extensively interpolated.

But there are serious difficulties in the way of accepting any of the above views, as I have attempted to show in an earlier paper.¹ For the present argument the following facts are particularly important: The only known writer who is named in the Theognidea is Theognis himself; the writers from whom the verses are said to be taken are earlier than Theognis; the argument of the Theognidean passages is frequently different from the doctrine of the poets from whom the passages are considered to be taken, and consistent only with that of the Theognidea; the text of the Theognidean passages usually differs widely from the corresponding text of the earlier writers to whom the passages are assigned—a fact that has been frequently observed. Consequently I have been led to conclude that all of these verses are

¹ See "A New Approach to the Theognis Question," *T. A. P. A.*, LVIII, 1927, pp. 170-198.

the genuine work of Theognis, but in the form of literary imitations of the earlier poets.²

The main difficulty in the way of deciding the question lies in the fact that outside of the Theognidea we have so little of early elegy preserved for purposes of comparison. Furthermore, whereas the Theognidea have been transmitted in an excellent early manuscript, the other elegiac poets are known only through quotations made by later writers. The question, then, at once arises whether such quotations have been made accurately from a text of the author, or from some secondary source or from memory, and consequently whether they vary, more or less, from the original text. We have no means at present of answering the question definitely and all we can do is to assume that, unless there is positive evidence to the contrary, the passage as quoted is reasonably reliable.³ But in spite of these difficulties, I believe that it is possible to arrive at some positive conclusion which is in harmony with the various factors involved. The question itself is of prime importance for the problem of the Theognidea.

The principle underlying the practice of antique literary imitation is well known and has been conveniently summarized thus:⁴ "In motive, scene, and phraseology the Greeks are possessed by the passion for imitation; and their literature is unique in the coextension of spontaneity with a 'commemorative instinct' that links its various forms by a chain of associative reminiscence. ἕτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφός. Every poet of Greece is a conscious bondsman to the past." This means that both the subject-matter and the style of an earlier master in any department of literature were considered to be the common property of those who followed him. Such imitation, however, was expected

² Cf. E. Harrison, *Studies in Theognis*, pp. 100-120; Lucas, *Studia Theognidea*, pp. 27 f.

³ For the various factors involved in the study of quotations as they affect the reading of a text, see the careful paper of Howes, *Harvard Studies*, VI, 1895, pp. 153 ff.; Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts*, pp. 141 ff. For the uncertainty of the text in quoted passages when found in an anthology, see *T. A. P. A.*, LVIII, 1927, p. 185, note 33.

⁴ H. W. Smyth, "Aspects of Greek Conservatism," *Harvard Studies*, XVII, 1906, p. 66. See also A. B. Cook, *Cl. Rev.*, XV, 1901, pp. 338 ff. T. W. Allen, *Cl. Rev.* XIX, 1905, pp. 387 ff.; and Caspar J. Kraemer, *Cl. Wk.*, XX, 1927, pp. 135 f., have some pertinent comments.

to be artistic and in the nature of improvement. Mere verbal borrowing alone or wholesale appropriation was condemned, and this seems to have been considered plagiarism in the strict sense.⁵ While the explicit theory is not older than the fifth century B. C., the practice is much older than that. Theognis, indeed, seems to be giving some hint of it when he speaks of guarding and protecting his poems by the "seal" of his name⁶ so that an inferior successor might not appropriate or weaken his verses without detection.

Such imitation was worked out in a variety of ways: by parody, by free translation, by modernization or by literary commonplace. It likewise included quotation and deliberate rivalry of a predecessor, sometimes in the form of sharp combat. Any one, or all, of these methods might be employed by a writer. Harrison thought that in verses 769-772 of the Theognidea we have a description by the poet of his method of composition under three heads:

χρῆ Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον, εἴ τι περισσὸν
εἰδείη, σοφίης μὴ φθονερὸν τελέθειν,
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μῶσθαι, τὰ δὲ δεικνύναι, ἄλλα δὲ ποιεῖν.
τί σφιν χρήσεται μῶνος ἐπιστάμενος;

He understood *μῶσθαι* to mean appropriation of a predecessor's work as a foundation; *δεικνύναι* would mean interpretation of a predecessor; *ποιεῖν* would be invention or creation by the poet himself, with little borrowing.⁷ This interpretation seems at least very plausible; but whether we accept it or not, it is clear that the Theognidea contain many reminiscences of earlier poets from Homer to Solon which show striking resemblances to their

⁵ See Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, 1920, pp. 46 ff.; E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, 1912. The distinction is made by Pseudo-Longinus; see below, note 54. The article by Perrin, "The Ethics and Amenities of Greek Historiography," *A. J. P.*, XVIII, 1897, pp. 255 ff., is not confined entirely to a discussion of the historians but necessarily includes the poets as well. It is particularly valuable for the agonistic aspect of antique literature, which is emphasized later on in the present paper. See below, pp. 356 f. and notes.

⁶ In the article cited in note 1 above, I have given what seem to me to be valid arguments for interpreting the "seal" as the poet's name.

⁷ Pindar, *Pyth.* I, 60; *Nem.* VIII, 20, uses *ἐξευρίσκω* in this sense. So also Stesichorus, fr. 34; Bacchylides, fr. 4, Jebb.

originals.⁸ What I hope to show in the present paper is that in numerous cases Theognis has taken passages, frequently several verses in length, from his predecessors, has changed them to suit the particular situation which they are intended to describe, and thereby has given a new setting to these earlier passages.

I.

Let us begin with the passages that resemble Solon.⁹ Verses 39-52 of the Theognidea describe the serious condition of the Megarian state.¹⁰ The writer fears the rise of some tyrant (ἐὺθυντῆρα κακῆς ὕβριος ἡμετέρης) for the populace is incurably greedy for wealth unjustly acquired. When such conditions exist ὕβρις arises, which gives birth to στάσις, which in turn results in the rise of the tyrant (μόνραρχος). Here Theognis is following Solon, frs. 4, 8, 9, 11, very closely, but he has adapted his own words to local conditions in Megara. The philosophy is the same in both poets except that Solon is speaking of the wealthy nobles and the leaders of the people primarily, while Theognis is referring to the wealthy commons who so recently had risen to power in the state. This distinction is important.¹¹

⁸ See J. G. Renner, *Ueber das Formelwesen im griechischen Epos und epische Reminiscenzen in der ältern griechischen Elegie*, Leipzig, 1872; R. Küllenberg, *De Imitatione Theognidea*, Argentorati, 1877; the notes of Hudson-Williams, *Early Greek Elegy*, London, 1926. Küllenberg's study is detailed and of particular value. Hesiod's many borrowings from Homer are the same in principle and they have been tabulated and discussed by Sihler, *T. A. P. A.*, XXX, 1902, pp. xxvi-xxxii.

⁹ All citations of the elegiac poets are made in accordance with the numbering in the fourth edition of Bergk's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. For Solon, as for all of the elegiac poets, the latest text is found in E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, Teubner, 1925.

¹⁰ Observe that the address to Cynus is found in all the poems of this group, and cf. below, p. 359. While I do not think that this address can be the poet's "seal" (cf. note 6, above), the poems that have it must be genuine if any are, and they form a good starting-point for any study of the question.

¹¹ For Athens, see Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* V, XII. Cf. Ch. Gilliard, *Quelques réformes de Solon*, Lausanne, 1907, particularly pp. 59 ff., who frequently compares the verses of Solon and Theognis and says of these similar passages in the two poets: "La plupart des doublets s'expli-

We have an interesting case of literary influence exemplified again in Theognis, vv. 153-4. The context has led up to the question how heaven brings ἔβρις upon a man. (Note the three preceding elegies, vv. 145-152). The poet replies that ἔβρις results from an "evil" man's acquisition of great wealth. This distich recalls Solon, fr. 4, but the two passages are by no means identical. Solon is explaining the principle that had guided him in his dealing with the populace at Athens when they were clamoring for a champion. He decided that moderation on the part of a leader of the people is best; for excess leads to arrogance if men lack sober judgment. Although both poets in this case are speaking of the populace, Solon's verses are sober and restrained, whereas Theognis indulges in a strong characterization of the commoner who had suddenly obtained wealth. To Theognis it is not primarily the degree of wealth but the character of its possessor that counts. The opposite view is presented by Solon.¹² Theognis has changed and adapted Solon's words here to his own peculiar point of view.

Verses 167-8 of Theognis tell us that no man is completely happy and recall Solon, fr. 14, and Solon's reputed conversation with Croesus (Hdt. I, 32). The text of each poem differs greatly, having in common only the tag ἥελιος καθορᾷ of the pentameter, which is found elsewhere in Theognis.¹³ A similar sentiment is expressed in vv. 441-6.

Verses 197-208. Compare Solon, fr. 13, 3 ff. Each poet is speaking of man's restless search for wealth. But wealth that is unjustly acquired ultimately brings destruction, though men do not always realize this. Elsewhere Theognis expresses his longing for honest wealth with the same degree of earnestness as Solon does here.¹⁴ But note that in the present passage Theognis states his principle abstractly while Solon resorts to

quent par le fait que les deux poètes étaient à peu près contemporains et parlaient tous deux de politique" (p. 60, note 3; cf. p. 66, note 3); of the wealthy class at Athens: "là comme ailleurs en Grèce, l'oligarchie formée par les riches n'est autre que l'ancienne oligarchie de sang, vue sous un autre aspect, considérée sous le rapport le plus frappant, avec son attribut le plus marquant: La fortune" (p. 86).

¹² See Solon, fr. 5.

¹³ See vv. 616; 850.

¹⁴ See vv. 753-6.

similes. Winter¹⁵ has called attention to the higher religious teaching of Theognis here as compared with that of Solon.

Verses 227-232. These are modeled closely on Solon, fr. 13, 71-6, but with important differences in every verse. Each poet is speaking of the mad quest of wealth which, knowing no bounds, leads to destruction. In Solon the pedigree is: *πλοῦτος—κέρδεια (κόρος)—ἄτη*. In Theognis *χρήματα—ἀφροσύνη—ἄτη*. But Solon is speaking of mankind in general, while Theognis again has reference to the commons.¹⁶

Verses 315-318. Compare Solon, fr. 15. The message of each poet is the same, namely, virtue is preferable to riches, for it endures. The verses as found in A are given to Theognis by Stobaeus (*Fl.* I, 16), but to Solon by Plutarch (*Solon*, 3). The differences in the text of the passages are slight. In the Solonian passage, however, the first verse is introduced by *γάρ*, showing that Plutarch has quoted only a part of the original passage. In Theognis the first verse is introduced by *τοῖ*—a very common practice in his elegies—and the group of four verses can easily stand alone as an independent thought. The four verses that follow (319-322) fit in nicely with the thought.¹⁷

Solon probably means to give to *ἀρετή* in the above passage a moral rather than a political connotation;¹⁸ if so, Theognis is quoting him, and is giving to Solon's verses his own meaning

¹⁵ W. M. Winter, *Die unter dem Namen Theognis überlieferte Gedichtssammlung*, Leipzig, 1906, pp. 50 ff. But Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, pp. 268 f., thinks that such a passage illustrates the way in which Solon's verses were later popularized, being analogous to the method by which the later rhapsodes "spoiled" the early epos.

¹⁶ Geyso, *Studia Theognidea*, p. 49, believes that a change has been made, in the use of *ἀφροσύνη* (cf. v. 223), in order to give an ethical meaning to the verses as found in Theognis. Winter, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 f., again calls attention to the higher religious conception of these verses as compared with that found in Solon, but accounts for the difference by claiming that the present form of the Theognidean verses is due to the "reviser," who wished to change Solon's words so that they would be consistent with the teaching of Theognis. One wonders why in that case the "reviser" cannot be Theognis.

¹⁷ Ancient writers in general were not always accurate in their ascription of quoted passages, as many examples show. Cf. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, pp. 13-15.

¹⁸ So Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, II, p. 305. But Linforth, *Solon the Athenian*, p. 213, does not agree.

of ἀρετή as the distinguishing quality of the old Dorian aristocracy, to which he himself belonged.

Verses 585-590. Compare Solon, fr. 13, 65-70. In this long poem Solon analyzes mankind's restless effort to better his lot and condition in life. He describes six typical occupations dwelling particularly on the quest of wealth and renown. But it is a gloomy picture; for Fate governs all and she is capricious. Uncertainty (κίνδυνος) attends all of our acts, while the evil man often prospers but the good man fails. Here Theognis changes his original considerably and his conclusion is not the same as Solon's. In Solon the well-doer meets with disaster, but in Theognis it is the man who is seeking a fair reputation. There are also many and important differences in vocabulary. But in Theognis the central thought is clearly this: Uncertainty (κίνδυνος) attends all of our acts. The man seeking a fair reputation meets with disaster, but the well-doer is blessed. That is, the uncertainty affects the evil man who discovers, sooner or later, that his purposes have been wrong. Theognis is clearly less pessimistic than Solon here. The balance by μέν . . . δέ in Theognis makes ὁ μὲν εὐδοκμεῖν πειρώμενος = ὁ εὐδοξος = ὁ κακός,¹⁹ since it is the latter who, according to regular Theogni-

¹⁹ Hudson-Williams, *ad. loc.*, calls this passage a "popular revision" of Solon's verses. But I cannot see that vv. 133-142 and 1075, which he cites as being more in harmony with Theognis' views, are different from the present passage except that in verses 141-2 the poet declares that, as mortal men, we know nothing about the future, whereas the gods control all things (cf. vv. 157-8; 617-18; Solon, fr. 13, 33-6). But in vv. 401-6 the gods are represented as leading the man who is bent on excessive wealth into trouble by confusing his mind. On the other hand, is not the good man in harmony with the gods (vv. 589-90), and therefore does he not ultimately triumph? A good commentary on vv. 401-6 is found in Soph. *Antig.* 617-25, a passage that is very close to these verses, if it is not a conscious imitation of them.

In v. 195 Theognis clearly contrasts εὐδοξος and κακόδοξος as equivalent to ἀγαθός and κακός, respectively, common names for noble and commoner. But just as he often uses ἀγαθός and κακός in the ironical sense also, so in v. 587 the periphrasis for εὐδοξος is ironical for κακός. In the present passage, however, he has been able to avoid the possible ironical sense of ἀγαθός (ἐσθλός) by using, in its place, the expression καλῶς ποιῶν, which is never ironical in his elegies.

Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, pp. 269 f., seems to explain the form of vv. 585-90 as due to the Alexandrian critics.

dean teaching, becomes involved in ἄτη. Compare vv. 227-232, above (χρήματα—ἀφροσύνη—ἄτη). But according to the argument of the present passage, the good man is freed from ἀφροσύνη and therefore is not involved in ἄτη. Theognis seems to be correcting Solon here.²⁰

Verses 719-728. This passage, as found in A, is given to Theognis by Stobaeus (*Fl.* IV, 33), but modern editors on the basis of Plutarch's quotation (*Solon*, 2) are inclined to give it to Solon, although Plutarch actually quotes only six verses, beginning with πολλὸς ἄργυρός ἐστιν. But these six verses differ considerably from the corresponding verses in Theognis, and it is very questionable whether Theognis 725-728, in their existing form, should also be attributed to Solon. Here again Theognis is probably imitating Solon, and vv. 719-728 very likely represent Theognis' version of his original.

Verses 949-954. Geyso²¹ would give these lines, as well as 955-970, to Solon, citing as evidence the grief of the latter when he was about to leave Athens. But the first group (949-954) is an erotic poem on the lover's fruitless conquest very probably.²² The second group (955-970) represents several distinct poems: The first (955 f.) on wasted kindness; the second (957 f.) on revenge; the third (959-962) on another love; the fourth (963-970) on the subject, "Time proves men's real characters—as I learned too late."

Finally, we have in vv. 1171-6 an encomium of γνώμη, a virtue far superior to ἔβρις and κόρος, for it is given to mortal man by the gods. Few will question that this poem belongs to Theognis since it contains the address to Cyrnus in the first and the last verses. An earlier couplet (895-6), also containing the address to Cyrnus, states that there is nothing superior to γνώμη and nothing more distressing than ἀγνωμοσύνη. In the former poem Theognis seems to be following Solon, fr. 16, who declares that it is difficult to know the full measure of the hidden wisdom of heaven,²³ which can accomplish all things. Solon had used γνωμοσύνη where Theognis has γνώμη, and πάντων πείρατα μῶνον

²⁰ Elsewhere (vv. 129-30; 637-40; 653-4; 1135-50) in a more melancholy mood he recognizes Hope and Chance as our divinities.

²¹ Geyso, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²² So Hudson-Williams, *ad. loc.*

²³ This explanation we owe to Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V, 12, 81.

ἔχει where Theognis has *πείρατα παντὸς ἔχει*. But the teaching of each is the same, except that Theognis enlarges somewhat upon the subject by contrasting the possession of *ὑβρις* and *κόρος*, which are common topics with him.²⁴

A comparison such as the above to me seems to show many points of difference between the poems of Solon and passages in the Theognidea that correspond to them. But the only explanation that takes into consideration all of the factors involved is to be found in the practice of literary imitation in its various aspects. It is not at all unnatural that Theognis should draw so heavily upon the writings of Solon. Both were of noble birth and determined reformers;²⁵ both lived during periods of social and economic change that had many features in common; both feared for the ultimate welfare of their states. Throughout the historical period we can detect, from time to time, mutual influences between Athens and Megara in comedy, in art and in philosophy. It seems entirely natural, therefore, that Theognis should seek in the writings of his distinguished Athenian neighbor aid and guidance in the crisis through which his own city was passing. *ἔτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφός*.

II.

A second poet from whom some passages of the Theognidea are said to have been taken is Tyrtaeus.²⁶ But with one exception the detailed resemblances are very slight.

²⁴ It is difficult to follow Linforth, *op. cit.*, p. 222, in his contrast of the poets here.

²⁵ Solon, however, considered himself a moderate reformer yielding to the extreme demands of neither the poor nor the wealthy (frs. 5, 6; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* XII). But Theognis was uncompromising in his opposition to the new régime and longed for the *εὐνομία* of the nobles. Furthermore, Solon had a practical program of reform to present to the Athenians, while Theognis spoke mostly in generalities.

²⁶ Since the appearance of Verrall's article in *Cl. Rev.* X, 1896, pp. 269 ff., the date of Tyrtaeus and the character of the extant fragments of his poems have been much discussed. But it now seems unnecessary to question the older tradition which placed him in the seventh century B. C., and made him an Athenian by birth who had been invited to take up residence in Sparta. See Bates, *T. A. P. A.* XVIII, 1897, pp. xlii-v; Macan, *Cl. Rev.*, XI, 1897, pp. 10-12; Dickins, *J. H. S.*, XXXII, 1912,

Verses 699-718. These verses follow the external structure of Tyrtaeus, fr. 12, 1-20, in some respects but the thought and content are entirely different. Tyrtaeus is speaking of the young warrior, and says that athletic prowess, beauty, power, eloquence and fame do not make a good warrior who will keep his place in the front rank of the battleline. Theognis is speaking of the "virtue" most prized by the commons—not true virtue from his point of view. But, he declares, if you possessed the self-control of Rhadamanthus, were wiser than Sisyphus, had the persuasive eloquence of Nestor, and were fleet of foot than the Harpies or the sons of Boreas—even so you could not persuade the rabble to forsake its greed for wealth. Tyrtaeus' closing words are:

ταύτης νῦν τις ἀνὴρ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἰκέσθαι
πειράσθω θυμῷ, μὴ μεθιὲς πολέμου, vv. 43-4.

But Theognis says:

πλήθει δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀρετὴ μία γίγνεται ἥδε,
πλουτεῖν τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐδὲν ἄρ' ἦν ὄφελος, vv. 699-700.²⁷

pp. 11 f.; Christ-Schmid, *Gesch. Gr. Lit.*, I, 1912, pp. 170-72; Geffcken, *Gr. Literaturgeschichte*, I, 1926, p. 71.

The fragments of Tyrtaeus' poems have been examined critically, chiefly by Wilamowitz, *Die Textgeschichte der gr. Lyriker*, 1900, pp. 97 ff., who has attempted to discover "the real Tyrtaeus." His conclusion is that the poems attributed to Tyrtaeus represent originals which, circulating about Athens in the form of a book of elegies, were revised and enlarged by the addition of various passages from other sources, as was the case with Hesiod and Theognis. In the extant fragments, then, we have interpolated poems. Cf. F. Jacoby, *Hermes*, LVIII, 1918, pp. 1 ff. In this view Wilamowitz has not been generally followed.

²⁷ In vv. 523-4 the poet declares that men worship Wealth more than any other god, for he tolerates their vice. He has similar statements elsewhere (vv. 1117-18, etc.). Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 313, seems to be the earliest extant writer to associate virtue and wealth, but he also (*op. cit.*, 319-334) gives warning that ill-gotten wealth only brings down the divine wrath. This warning became a common theme during the lyric period largely, no doubt, because of the character of the economic and social changes that were then taking place. For πλοῦτος in its various aspects, see Fr. Hübner, *De Pluto*, Halis Saxoniæ, 1914.

For the present argument it makes no essential difference whether we read βροτοί with the MSS. or θεῶν, after Stobaeus. Diehl reads βροτοί.

The indications that Theognis is here imitating Tyrtaeus are several: the external structure of each poem; the appeal to mythical or semi-mythical types of character in each case; the presence of a refrain in each.²⁸ But Theognis has changed the meaning of ἀρετή from that which is purely physical to the sphere of the moral and intellectual. He also uses the word δύναμις (v. 718) not with reference to physical strength but with reference to one's influence in the state.²⁹ Verse 713 is a clear reminiscence of Homer, *Od.* XIX, 203, and of Hesiod, *Theog.* 27. Verse 707 is almost identical with *Odyssey*, IV, 188. Verse 706 is almost an exact repetition of v. 430.

Theognis seems here to be imitating, but adapting to his own peculiar purpose, the words of the great martial poet. There is but little praise of war in his elegies and he prefers to give to such words as ἀρετή and δύναμις an ethical meaning.

Verses 879-884. This passage Reitzenstein assigned to "some Laconian imitator" of Tyrtaeus (perhaps Chilon?).³⁰ But the epithet θεοῖσι φίλος only plays upon the name Θεότιμος, who very probably was one of the poet's Laconian friends that had entertained him so royally during his visit to Sparta (vv. 783-8).

Verses 1003-1006. Compare Tyrtaeus, fr. 12, 13-16. The two passages are identical except that Theognis writes σοφῶ (v. 1004) where Tyrtaeus has νέψ (v. 14). Observe that the change in the Theognidean passage stands in the pentameter. Tyrtaeus'

²⁸ See Theognis, vv. 699 and 718; Tyrtaeus, vv. 10 and 20. Very probably the Tyrtaean passage ultimately goes back to Homer, *Iliad*, IX, 379-92; XIV, 315-328, as the external form strongly suggests. Xenophanes' famous diatribe against the professional athlete (fr. 2, 1-22) is modeled closely on Tyrtaeus' poem. Wilamowitz, however, thinks that the Tyrtaean poem cannot be earlier than the time of the Sophists. But he concedes that it is a complete poem, neatly constructed, and pretty. See *Die Textgeschichte*, pp. 111 ff.; *Sappho und Simonides*, p. 257, note 1.

²⁹ The word is so used in vv. 34; 412; 420. Observe that in v. 412 the address to Cyrnus is found.

³⁰ F. Jacoby, *l. c.*, p. 5, calls v. 881 "evidente Nachahmung eines alten Stückes." The epithet φίλος θεοῖς is found as early as Homer (*Iliad*, XX, 347 (of Aeneas), and is used elsewhere in the Theognidea: v. 653, of the poet himself and addressed to Cyrnus; v. 1119, again of the poet—φίλοι δέ με Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. Cf. Pindar, *Isth.* VI, 13, θεότιμος ἔων, said of one who has gained success through divine aid.

appeal is constantly to young men, and it is likely that Theognis is here combating his predecessor.³¹ For elsewhere ³² he declares that wealth may be possessed by the worthless man (*ἄχρηστος*), whereas the courageous warrior preserves his native land and his home. Perhaps in the present passage Theognis means to say that the *wise man* (be he young or old) will defend his native land, and we may interpret *ἄνθρωπος σοφός* as synonymous with *πιστὸς ἄνθρωπος* of vv. 77-8, who is there said to be more valuable than silver or gold because of his loyalty in time of strife. Plato ³³ has made much of the latter passage in his contrast of Tyrtaeus and Theognis.

III.

A few verses have been attributed to Mimnermus. The main reason assigned is that these verses reflect the luxury of Ionia, and therefore are not appropriate to a Dorian poet.

Verses 793-796. In the Palatine Anthology IX, 50, vv. 795-6 are attributed to Mimnermus. For this reason Bergk gave the first, as well, to that poet. In the view of the anthologist, the controlling incentive of the two verses is the allusion to the desirability of enjoying oneself freely.³⁴ But if we examine the entire group as found in the Theognidea we discover that such a sentiment is entirely secondary, while the central thought is this: Be just to stranger and to your fellow-citizen, and thus make glad your heart. This sentiment is found frequently in the Theognidea.³⁵ The anthologist, however, may have found

³¹ So Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-102. But Wilamowitz, *Die Textgeschichte*, p. 111 and note 1, characterizes the verses as belonging to Tyrtaeus but "mit einer schlechten Aenderung" which rests "auf Willkür des Umarbeiters."

³² See vv. 865-8.

³³ Plato, *Laws*, I, 627 e-632 d. The main argument is that Tyrtaeus praises merely *ἀνδρεία*, a virtue noble in itself but of the fourth rank, while the hero of Theognis possesses the very first of the virtues (*δικαιοσύνη*) in addition to *σωφροσύνη*, *φρόνησις*, and *ἀνδρεία*. Here Plato is contrasting loyalty in the midst of internal strife (*στάσις*) and valor displayed in external war (*πόλεμος*).

³⁴ The lemma in the Anthology runs: *Μιμνέρμου· παραλυσίς εἰς τὸ ἀνέτως ζῆν*.

³⁵ See vv. 511-22; 1135-50, etc.

the single couplet that he quotes in some secondary source, or he may have interpreted the words *τὴν σαντοῦ φρένα τέρπε*, which stand at the head of v. 795, as those of Mimnermus because the latter so frequently speaks of enjoying life while one may. The Palatine Anthology shows little familiarity with Theognis.

Verses 1017-1022. This passage is given to Mimnermus by Stobaeus (*Fl.* 116, 34). The verses, however, belong to a group in the Theognidea which includes vv. 1007-1022. This group (or this poem) deals with the subject of fleeting youth and the approach of grim old age, which again is a common topic in the Theognidea.³⁶ And, although Stobaeus was very familiar with Theognis, in the present case he may have felt that so light a theme was unsuitable to the Dorian poet, and consequently gave the verses to Mimnermus on the same principle perhaps as did the anthologist in the preceding passage. Such anthologists were given to the classification of *sententiae* according to some definite plan and with some definite purpose. For this reason they would frequently even change the text of the original.³⁷ In cases of such conflicting evidence I believe that we should give precedence to our good manuscripts.

IV.

There are still two other examples that clearly illustrate the manner in which Theognis borrowed from his predecessors. The first is found in vv. 1197-1202, a lyric on the poet's lost estate. Here again the address to Polypaides (Cyrnus) will permit few to question that the passage belongs to Theognis.³⁸ The poet laments that the voice of the spring bird whistling clear brings him no joy, for others now possess his estate.³⁹ Theognis here is clearly following Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 448 ff.,⁴⁰ who warns the farmer that the voice of the crane is

³⁶ See vv. 527-8; 1069-70; 1131-2; 983-8.

³⁷ See O. Crüger, *De locorum Theognideorum apud veteres scriptores exstantium ad textum poetae emendandum pretio*, Regimontii, 1882.

³⁸ Polypaides and Cyrnus are combined in the same poem as follows: vv. 19-26; 53-68 (bis); 183-92. In vv. 213-18, the word Cyrnus appears and in v. 215 there is clearly a play upon Πολυπαίδης.

³⁹ Cf. vv. 341-50; 825-30.

⁴⁰ So Hudson-Williams, *ad. loc.*, who has tabulated the correspondences.

the harbinger of fall calling to him to yoke his oxen to the plow. But what is only a commonplace passage in Hesiod has been transformed by Theognis into a lyric poem of much feeling and no little beauty.

Finally, we have the enigmatical passage of vv. 1209-1216. Here the poet says in substance: "I belong to the family of Aithon and I dwell in well-walled Thebe. I am a stranger in a strange land, an exile. But I am free, Argyris, for I have a city—close to Lethaeus' plain." The proper names employed and the descriptive details that are given lead me to offer the following interpretation. The poet, calling himself Aithon, was now in exile at Thebes.⁴¹ During a banquet he is twitted by the *hetaira* Argyris because of his banishment. But he replies that while his misfortunes have been many since leaving his native land, slavery is not one of them, for he has a city.⁴²

The use of the name Aithon recalls *Odyssey* XIX, 165 ff., where Odysseus is questioned by Penelope concerning his family, since she does not recognize him but thinks that he is a stranger. He replies that he is Aithon of Crete, has visited many cities and suffered many hardships during his long absence from home. The form Θήβη is used elsewhere by Homer of Thebes.⁴³ The word Ἀργυρίς (v. 1212) is certainly the name of an *hetaira*.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Diehl has needlessly changed Αἴθων (the reading of A) to Λήθων because of v. 1216.

⁴² For the hard lot of the exile in early Greece, see Tyrtaeus, fr. 10; Solon, fr. 4.

⁴³ See *Odyssey*, XI, 263, 265, 275.

⁴⁴ This name is not found in Lambertz, *Die griechischen Sklavennamen*, 1907. But its appropriateness is suggested by Pindar, *Isth.* II, 6-8, speaking of the muse of old before odes were purchased for money:

ἀ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδὴς πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.

Cf. the schol. commenting on the girls in Pindar's metaphor: πρόσωπον κεκοσμημέναι καὶ λαμπρυνθεῖσαι ὅτι τὰ ὄνια ὡς τῶν πωλούντων τὰ πρόσωπα κοσμοῦνται. The reference here is probably to the use of white lead (ψιμύθιον). [But see *Cl. Rev.* 2. 180 and *A.J.P.* 38. 110.—Ed.]

In vv. 825-30 a slave (Σκύθα) is addressed at a banquet, and there are references in the poems to the various effects of slavery. Some have thought that Argyris was Theognis' wife.

The epithet *καλή* (v. 1216) applied to the city is not unlike other epithets used of Megara.⁴⁵ The final expression *Ληθαίῳ κεκλιμένη πεδίῳ* very aptly describes Magnesia, which was located in the plain of the Maeander but close to which, on the north and east, flowed the Lethaeus river.⁴⁶ For in two places⁴⁷ the poet declares that *ὑβρις* such as destroyed Magnesia will also destroy Megara. The last verse, therefore, is probably a veiled expression—a kind of riddle (*γρίφος*)⁴⁸—describing the poet's native city. Homer's words recounting the narrative of Odysseus to Penelope seem strangely applicable to the present case also:

"Ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα.

Similar veiled expressions are found elsewhere in the Theognidea.⁴⁹

Further confirmation of the above interpretation is found in the fact that Theognis elsewhere seemed to see in the wander-

⁴⁵ See vv. 604; 788; 947; 1044. These are all typical Homeric epithets of cities.

⁴⁶ See Strabo, XIV, 647; cf. C. Humann, *Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin, 1904. The ancient city was first destroyed about 625 B. C.

⁴⁷ See vv. 603-4; 1103-4, which contain the address to Cyrnus. The woes of Magnesia had become proverbial by Theognis' time. Cf. Archil., fr. 20; Hudson-Williams on Theognis 1103-4.

⁴⁸ Cf. W. Schultz, Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. Rätsel (1920), p. 91. Athenaeus (X, 457) informs us that it was customary during the course of an Athenian dinner-party for one guest to name a city in Europe beginning with a certain letter, at the same time challenging another guest to name a city in Asia beginning with the same letter. If a similar custom was followed at Thebes, as we may reasonably assume, Argyris probably thus challenged Theognis. But, instead of replying with the name "Megara," corresponding to "Magnesia," the poet responded with a cryptic description of Megara, according to the interpretation that I have adopted. Argyris may have come from the district of Magnesia.

Reitzenstein thought that Aithon of this passage was some unknown writer who was in exile at Thebes and was thus speaking through the verses in the first person.

⁴⁹ See particularly vv. 667-82, the riddle of the ship of state, which was addressed to Simonides, some friend of the poet, apparently during the course of a banquet. Note the words

ταῦτά μοι ἤνιχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν
γινώσκω δ' ἂν τις καὶ κακός, ἂν σοφὸς ἦ.

The part. *συνών* (v. 668) easily suggests the more technical *συνουσία*.

ings and hardships of Odysseus the prototype of his own exile. Thus, he declares⁵⁰ that he has suffered ills as grievous as those of Odysseus; and the description of his exile⁵¹ sounds much like the words of Odysseus to Alcinous.⁵² On one occasion⁵³ he counseled the young Cynus to manifest the character of an Odysseus.

V.

Antique literary theory recommended such close imitation of an earlier master. The writer of *περὶ ὕψους* urges the imitation and emulation of the writers of the past as one of the paths leading to the elevated style.⁵⁴ Such an expression on the part of a writer who came so long after the time of Theognis only states the working of a traditional practice that was very old. For in the passage referred to Pseudo-Longinus observes that Homer was the great source from whom Stesichorus, Archilochus, Herodotus and Plato all drew. In conformity with this principle, I believe it can be maintained that Theognis thus drew from Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus and Solon, not to mention Homer and Hesiod; and that such borrowing is sufficient to explain the character of the verses that have been discussed above.

One additional topic requires brief notice. In several cases where the Theognidea resemble closely some earlier poet's work, the explanation is evidently to be found in the practice of poetic rivalry. This is, of course, only a particular aspect of literary imitation and it has already been touched upon. It was suggested above that Theognis at times seems to be correcting Tyrtaeus and Solon. The formal literary contests between poets, which were so common among the Greeks from early

⁵⁰ Verses 1123-8.

⁵¹ Verses 783-8.

⁵² Homer, *Odyssey*, IX, 27-36; particularly vv. 28, 34-6.

⁵³ See vv. 213-18. He does not name Odysseus but the adj. *πολύπλοκος* (= *πολύτροπος*) of v. 215, and the general idea of the passage at once suggested the wily Odysseus. Cf. Hudson-Williams, *ad. loc.*

⁵⁴ Ps.-Longinus, *περὶ ὕψους*, 13-14. Cf. Bacchylides, fr. 4 (Jebb): "Poet is heir to poet, now as of yore; for in sooth 'tis no light task to find the gates of virgin song." Jebb observes that this may well be a gentle and modest protest to Pindar's scornful utterances against the *διδασκαὶ ἀπεραὶ*.

times, imply a feeling of rivalry that must always have been present in the mind of an aspiring poet even when a formal public contest could not, in the nature of the case, take place. It has been pointed out⁵⁵ in the case of Greek literature that "success was not so much the success of positive achievement as the glory of comparative personal triumph over rivals." Homer seems to hint at this when he says that

"That song pleases men most which rings newest in the ear."⁵⁶

Hesiod recommends such competition as follows:

"Such strife as this is good for men

While bard vies with bard."⁵⁷

But a poet seldom, if ever, named the predecessor or contemporary whom he was thus correcting, and we recall the veiled allusions in Solon,⁵⁸ Aeschylus,⁵⁹ and Pindar.⁶⁰ The subjective character of Theognis' poems probably kept him in particular from making any direct reference to his predecessors. In those poems where some person is named he seems always to be addressing a friend.

VI.

The passages discussed above have an important bearing upon the question whether or not the Theognidea represent an anthology. We may again summarise the pertinent facts as follows. First, in none of the verses is any known poet's name men-

⁵⁵ B. Perrin, *A. J. P.*, XVIII, 1897, p. 269. Cf. note 5, above.

⁵⁶ See *Odyssey*, I, 351-2.

⁵⁷ See *Works and Days*, 24-6. The technical name for such rivalry was ζῆλος or ἀγών. See Fiske, *op. cit.*, pp. 43 ff., 322.

⁵⁸ Solon, fr. 20, in reply to Mimnermus, fr. 6, on the question at what age a man should be ready to die. Cf. Diog. Laert. I, 2, 13. Solon here addresses Mimnermus as Λιγυστάδην, "son of Ligystas" (?). Perhaps the name is only complimentary, and Linforth translates it "thou scion of sweet song."

⁵⁹ Aeschylus, *Agam.* 369-73. This probably refers to Diagoras, the atheistic lyric poet, whom Aeschylus here describes simply thus: οὐκ ἔφα τις . . . ὁ δ' οὐκ εὖσεβής.

⁶⁰ Pindar, *Pyth.* I, 41-6: ἀντρίους, thought to refer to Corax, Bacchylides, and Simonides. See the commentators, and cf. *Olymp.* II, end. Cf. also Bacchylides as in note 54, above, and Jebb, *Bacchylides*, pp. 13 ff.

tioned. But if such passages have been extracted merely from the works of others by some later anthologist, it is strange that those writers are never mentioned. It is true that Reitzenstein thought he could detect seven other writers besides Theognis in the elegies, but he admitted that most of these writers were otherwise unknown, and his identification was only conjectural in any case. But we should expect that the names of Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus and Solon, at least, would be given in connection with the passages taken from them.⁶¹

Second, the writers upon whose poems the Theognidean passages are based are all earlier than Theognis. Is it likely that a later anthologist would have confined his selections to such early writers? That was not the regular practice; for the anthologist was accustomed to select from writers of all periods, both early and late. It is, of course, possible that an entirely new style of anthology might arise; but when we recall that the Greeks of all periods were bound by tradition so closely, it is not likely that they would countenance so radical a departure from the common type of anthology.

Third, the differences in text of two corresponding passages can be explained on the principle of literary imitation.

Fourth, rivalry of a predecessor as well as of a contemporary was common in Greece from early times; and proximity of Megara to Athens as well as social and economic conditions which, in many ways, were quite similar in both cities, naturally led Theognis to draw freely from the writings of Solon in particular.

⁶¹ In my previous paper, cited in note 1, above, I pointed out the fact that an important characteristic of all anthologies is the regular practice of giving, or attempting to give, the name of the author from whom a passage is taken. Fragments of anthologies preserved in the papyri conform to this principle. Cf. A. D. Knox, *The First Greek Anthologist*, Cambridge 1923, p. 2, speaking of the papyrus containing parts of the Cynic Cecidas (?), who comes soon after 250 B. C.: "Like all anthologies it has lemmata, or headings, giving the name and a few lines of the author quoted." "It is only necessary to notice how this anthology, if it be the first anthology, set up fashions which have generally been followed throughout the ages" (p. 12). Cf. J. U. Powell in Powell and Barber, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Oxford 1921, on the same papyrus fragment.

Fifth, it is worth noting that in many of the passages discussed above the address to Cynos (or Polypaides) is found. Observe vv. 39-42; 43-52; 895-6; 1171-6; 1197-1202; and the related passages. Such verses are considered to be the genuine work of Theognis by most writers, if any are genuine. But they follow the phraseology of the earlier poets quite as closely as do others that are without the address.

E. L. HIGHBARGER.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

A PRE-INDO-EUROPEAN CHANGE OF *u* TO *m* AFTER *u* OR *a*.

The frequent interchange of *w* and *m* in Hittite verb-forms, especially from causatives in *nu*, was noted by Hrozný,¹ but he did not reach a final decision as to which sound was original. A number of other scholars² have noticed the phenomenon and have cited additional examples. Hrozný, Götze, and Sommer all hold that *m* was sometimes written where *w* was pronounced. Delaporte³ sums up the known facts thus:

54.—*w* peut se changer en *m* au nominatif-accusatif et au génitif de l'infinitif actif si le radical du verbe se termine par *u*; il en est de même aux temps personnels quand la terminaison commence par *w*.

56.—Comme en accadien, la consonne *m* est parfois employée dans l'écriture au lieu de *w* et se prononce comme *w*.

Since nearly all instances of *m* for *w* show *u* before the altered sound,⁴ it appears that we have to do with a phonetic law by which *w* after *u* became *m*. It is clear, however, that the law had ceased to operate long before the date of our texts, and that its effects had been partly obscured by analogical changes. For *w* after *u* is very common, and, as already noted, some instances of *m* for *w* are merely graphic.

A large part of the forms with *m* for *w* are infinitives in *mar* or *maš*,⁵ supines in *manzi* or *man*, or first persons plural in

¹ *Die Sprache der Hethiter* 155, 173 f., 174₁.

² Forrer, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 76. 211_{6,7,8}; Sommer and Ehelolf, *Boghazköi-Studien* 10. 18. 74; Götze, *Madduwattaš* 120 and fn. 4.

³ *Grammaire de la Langue Hittite* 10 f.

⁴ The exceptions of which I know are all cited by Götze, *Madd.* 120₄. See below, p. 363.

⁵ I have no doubt that the forms in *waš* and *maš* are genitives of the infinitival noun (see Friedrich, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* NF 1. 9 ff.; Götze, *Hattušiliš* 140). The inflection originated in the infinitives in *mar*, where the genitival *mnaš* regularly yielded *m(m)aš* (see Ehelolf, *ZA* NF 2. 313 and fn. 6; Götze, *Madd.* 131). The forms like *šarninkweš* and *daweš* preserve the original genitive ending *es* (Lat. *pedis*, etc.). The inherited pair *šarninkwaš* and *šarninkweš* were re-interpreted as corresponding singular and plural, and that is the reason for the survival of the genitive ending *es* here alone in Hittite.

meni or *men*; these terminations regularly begin with *m* instead of *w* in all verbs whose stem ends in *u*. Typical examples are: *te-ep-nu-mar* 'humiliation, reviling' (*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* 5. 6. = 2BoTU. 41. 4. 1),⁶ *wa-ah-nu-mar* 'turning' (KBo. 1. 42. 3. 47), *ar-nu-um-ma-áš* 'of washing' (KBo. 5. 1. 4. 15), *wa-ar-nu-ma-áš* 'of burning' (*Keilschrift-Urkunden aus Boghazköi* 13. 2. 2. 5), *wa-ah-nu-um-ma-an-zi* 'to turn' (Hrozný, *SH* 173), *ar-nu-um-me-ni* 'we bring' (KUB 4. 1. 2. 6), *wa-ar-šá-nu-mi-ni* 'we appease' (KUB 16. 39. 2. 44), *a-ú-me-en* 'we saw' (KUB 9. 34. 3. 39).

The corresponding forms of a number of verbs with stems ending in an original long vowel also show *u* as stem-final and *m* as the initial consonant of the termination. Examples follow: *tum-me-ni* (Yale Tablet 1. 30 = *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 58. 25), *tu(m)-um-me-ni* 'we take' (KUB 17. 28. 1. 10) : *da-ah-hi* : Indo-European **dō-* 'give'; *ú-tum-me-e-ni* 'we take' (KBo. 6. 29. 2. 27), *ú-tum-me-en* 'we took' (KBo. 4. 2. 2. 34) : *ú-da-ah-hi* : IE **au* + **dō-*; *pé-e-tum-me-e-ni* 'we take with us' (KUB 9. 27. 1. 17) : *pé-e-da-áš*; *tar-nu-um-ma-ni* 'we let go' (Hrozný *SH* 172), *tar-nu-mar* (KBo. 1. 35. 8), *tar-nu-um-ma-áš* (Hrozný *SH* 173), *tar-nu-ma-an-zi* (KUB 5. 6. 2. 58) : *tar-na-ah-hi*, *tar-na-a-i*; *pé-en-nu-um-ma-an-zi* 'to drive' (KBo. 2. 5. 2. 21) : *pé-en-na-ah-hi*; *u-un-nu-um-me-en* 'we drove' (*Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from the British Museum* 1. 2. 27) : *u-un-na-i*; *wa-áš-du-mar* 'sin' (KBo. 4. 14. 2. 60, 64, 71) : *wa-áš-ta-at-ti*, *wa-áš-ta-i*, *wa-áš-ta-áš*; *šú-un-nu-mar* 'a filling' (KBo. 1. 42. 3. 51) : *šú-un-na-i*; *šarrumar*, *šarrumaš* 'a transgressing' (Delaporte, *Gramm.* 73) : *šarratti*, *šarra-i*; *ku-en-nu-um-mi-e-ni* 'we smite' (KBo. 6. 29. 2. 25) : *kuenna(i)*.⁷ These forms certainly contain the reduced grade of the suffix or of the final syllable of the root, and therefore we must apparently conclude that PIE *u* became Hittite *um*. The alternative is to suppose that *um(m)* here stands for *w* (cf. *uwa* = *wa*; see pp. 363 f. below), so that *tu(m)-um-me-ni* would be pronounced *tweni*; which is unlikely because the orthography in question rarely occurs in a verb whose stem ends in a consonant (we do not find **e-šú-mar*

⁶ Cf. Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1. 291.

⁷ See Götze ap. Delaporte, *Gramm.* 66.

beside *e-šú-u-wa-ar* for *ešwar* 'to be'), and because there is a decided tendency to write *m* double in these words.

Since the IE noun suffixes corresponding to Hittite *war* and *wanzi* (see below, pp. 366-8) regularly take the full grade of the root, monosyllabic roots should show full grade here, although dissyllabic roots would naturally present full grade + *nil*-grade. Hence the infinitives *da-a-u-wa-ar* (*KBo.* 1. 53. 10), *daweš*, and the supine *dawanzi* (Delaporte, *Gramm.* 73) are the normal forms. The first plural *tummeni*, however, as well as *tarnumar* and *wašdumar* are phonologically correct.

The influence of other verbs sometimes restored *w* in words of these two classes; e. g. *an-na-u-wa-[ar]* (*KBo.* 1. 30. 1. 20) : *an-na-nu-ut* (*KBo.* 3. 34. 2. 30); *wa-ah-nu-u-wa-ar* (*KUB* 1. 11. 1. 9), *ú-wa-ah-nu-wa-ar* (*KBo.* 3. 2. 1. 9, 62, 3. 5. 4. 30); *da-a-u-en* (*KBo.* 3. 60. 3. 12 = *2BoTU.* 21. 3. 11); *pé-en-nu-an-zi* 'to drive' (*KBo.* 3. 5. 2. 4); *tar-nu-en* (*KBo.* 3. 60. 3. 7 = *2BoTU.* 21. 3. 6); *me-ma-u-e-ni* (*KUB* 13. 35. 4. 14). Possibly *ša-ra-a-u-an-zi* (*KBo.* 5. 1. 3. 54) belongs here; Sommer and Ehelolf's⁸ objections to connecting the verb with *šara* 'up' and interpreting it as 'lift' or 'fasten up' do not seem conclusive, but that etymology would not prove that the stem ended in an original long vowel. The supine *šarrumawanzi* (Delaporte, *Gramm.* 73) must have resulted from contamination of **šarrumanzi* and **šarrawanzi*.

As a result of confusion between these *w*-endings and *m*-endings, signs containing *m* came to be regarded as possible means of writing the sound *w*, particularly if *u* preceded. The process was no doubt helped along by the interchange of *m* and *w* in the Akkadian texts with which the scribes were familiar. The reason why *m* was used for *w* rather than the reverse was the scarcity of signs containing *w*. Probably the *w* from a consonantal glide in certain forms of the *u*-stem verbs (see below, p. 366) was first to be written in this way. I have noted *ar-ru-ma-an-zi* 'they wash' (*KBo.* 3. 5. 1. 23), and *wa-ah-nu-ma-a[n-za]* (*KUB* 1. 11. 4. 24). The new orthography must have been convenient also in the oblique cases of *u*-stem nouns and adjectives (*aššuwaš*, *aššuwi*, etc.). Götze reports *par-ku-*

⁸ *BoSt.* 10. 70 f.

mu-uš. Contamination of this with the usual accusative plural, *aššawaš*, yielded *i-da-la-mu-uš*, *par-ga-mu-uš*, *da-áš-ša-mu-uš*, *ki-e-la-mu-uš*.⁹ The derivative verb *išharanuwa(i)*- 'make bloody' (*iš-har-nu-wa-an-zi*—*KBo.* 6. 34. 3. 47; *iš-har-nu-wa-an-da*—*KUB* 9. 4. 3. 42) is sometimes written with *m* for *w*, e. g. *iš-har-nu-ma-iz-zi* (*KBo.* 5. 1. 1. 26).¹⁰

Presently the complex *um* before a vowel came to stand for *w*, much as *uwa* was written for *wa* (see the next paragraph). Thus we find *ú-e-tu-ma-an-zi* 'to build' (*KBo.* 5. 6. 1. 6) : *ú-e-te-ez-zi*, *ú-e-ta-an-za*. Götze, *Madd.* 120, has shown that *nekumanza* 'naked' is related to Lat. *nūdus*, Goth. *naqaps*, from IE **nogvedhos*, and has suggested that *kum* is merely a graphic representation of labiovelar *gʷ* (cf. *ša-ku-wa* for *šakwa* 'eyes'¹¹). He considers *nekumanza* a participle from a verb **nekwa-*; but I should prefer to derive it from PIE **negʷodh-*, with intrusion of *n*, after the change of *dh* to *t*, on the analogy of participles, adjectives, and nouns with stem in *nt* (cf. the shift to the *nt*-declension in *gimmanza* 'winter' : Skt. *heman-tas* and *humanza* 'all' : Skt. *bhūman* 'earth', etc.). The change of *gʷ* to *kw* makes difficulty on account of *wemiyami* 'I come to, find' : IE **gʷem-*, *huwiyami* 'I flee' : IE **bheugʷ-*, and *walh-* 'strike' : Gk. *βάλλω*.¹² One must assume that *gʷ* before *o* became *kw*, although before other vowels it yielded *w*.

We have noticed that some instances of *w* after *u* are analogical restorations; but we must consider also the great mass of material where such an analogy does not suggest itself. We may turn first to the curious use of the orthography *uwa* for *wa*. Probably this usage arose at the beginning of a word, where the sound-group *kwa* could not be accurately written with cuneiform characters; the scribes could write *ku-at* or *ku-wa-at*, and they preferred the latter. It is not so easy to explain the use of *ku-u-wa* in the same value or of *ša-u-wa* for *šawa*, *ú-wa* for *wa*, *tu-u-ik* for *twik*, etc. Of the facts, however, there can be no question.

Particularly convincing are the words for which we have two

⁹ For references to the texts, see Götze, *Madd.* 120₄.

¹⁰ See Sommer and Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10. 18.

¹¹ See *Language* 3. 163.

¹² See *Language* 3. 220.

equivalent orthographies, such as these: (nom.) ^{SAL}ha-a-šá-u-wa-áš (KUB 7.1.4.5) : (acc.) ^{SAL}ha-a-šá-wa-an (ib. 3.10); (supine) šá-a-ru-wa-u-wa-an-zi (KBo. 4.4.4.21) : (pret.) šar-wa-it (Götze, *Madd.* 156.2.30); ši-ú-wa-ri-ya-wi (Forrer, *Forschungen* 1.260₅) = ši-wa-ri-ya-wi (KUB 19.55. lower margin 4 = Forrer, *Forsch.* 1.260.53); tu-u-ig-ga-áš (KUB 15.32.1.1) : tu-e-ik-ki (KBo. 5.2.1.8);¹³ ú-wa-ah-nu-wa-ar (KBo. 3.5.4.30) = wa-ah-nu-u-wa-ar (KUB 1.11.1.9); ú-wa-áš-ta-i (KBo. 3.28.2.10 = 2BoTU. 10 γ 9) = wa-áš-ta-a-i (KBo. 3.3.2.11); ú-wi-te-na-áš 'of water' (KUB 13.3.3.1, 22) : ú-e-te-na-az 'from water' (KBo. 3.2.1.4).

Scarcely less conclusive is the etymological proof implied in such forms as the following. Besides *ku-iš*, *ku-it* = Lat. *quis*, *quid* we have *ku-wa-at* 'why' = Lat. *quod*, and several other forms that must belong to the stem ***quo-*, namely *ku-wa-pí* 'when, where', *ku-wa-pí-it* 'where', and *ku-wa-at-ta-an* 'whither'. I would add to the list *ku-wa-at-ta*, which seems to be equivalent to Lat. *quot*, Skt. *kati* 'how many', although it is used with a singular pronoun and verb. The word occurs in KBo. 3.34 = 2BoTU. 12 A 2.8-11: ¹Aš-ga-li-ya-áš ^{URU}Hu-ur-mi EN-áš e-eš-ta a-pa-a-áš-šá ku-wa-at-ta ku-wa-at-ta LÜ. MEŠ e-eš-ta šá-na-áš-ta at-ti-mi pa-ak-nu-ir šá-an ar-nu-ut šá-an ^{URU}An-ku-i IR.DI šá-an ^{URU}An-ku-i-pít LÜABRIG-an i-e-it, 'Ašgaliyaš was ruler in Hurma, and all the people there¹⁴ praised(?) him to my father. He sent for him; he came to Ankuaš; he made him keeper of the seal there in Ankuaš.' Similar cases of etymological proof that *uwa* may stand for *wa* are *ku-wa-áš-ki-it*, iterative-durative of *ku-en-ta* 'he struck', and *šá-ku-wa* 'eyes' : IE **oqu-*.¹⁵

In this way many of the verb-forms with written *uwa* and *uwe* are to be explained. Sometimes one may interpret the *u* inserted before *wa* as intended for a double writing of the consonant,

¹³ Götze, *Madd.* 133, seems to interpret these and similar forms as indicating *tuwek-*, and he may be right. At any rate there is no reason to suppose that both *tuwek-* and *tuwek-* were heard.

¹⁴ I. e. 'isque quot quot homines erat.' Possibly, however, *ešta* is here present middle from *eš-* 'dwell', in which case it may be rendered by 'versatur'.

¹⁵ With pro-ethnic variation between forms with and without initial *s*? Cf. *Language* 3.163.

e. g. *ha-an-da-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.35.10), *ka-ni-ni-ya-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.42.2.43), *da-a-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.53.10), *ta-áš-ši-ya-u-wa-ar* (KUB 9.4.3.38), *pu-nu-uš-ki-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.44.1.12). But in the numerous cases like the following the written *uwa* must stand for *wa*: *e-šú-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.42.1.7 f.) : *e-eš-zi* 'he is'; *har-ni-in-ku-u-ar* (KBo. 3.4.1.36) : *har-ni-ik-zi* 'he destroys'; *kar-pu-u-wa-ar* (KUB 3.105.1.5) : *kar-ap-zi* 'he takes'; *na-ah-hu-u-wa-áš* (Hatt. 4.55) : *na-ah-ta* 'he feared'; *še-e-šú-wa-áš* (KBo. 5.11.4.26) : *še-eš-zi* 'he sleeps'; *ši-pa-an-du-wa-áš* (KBo. 4.13.3.33) : *ši-ip-pa-an-du-ar* (KBo. 1.42.4.44), *ši-pa-an-ti* 'he pours a libation'; *du-wa-ar-nu-wa-ar* (KUB 3.95.8) : *tu-wa-ar-ni-iz-zi* 'he breaks'; *wa-ar-pu-u-ar* (KUB 7.10.5.3) : *wa-ar-ap-zi* 'he washes'; *wa-áš-šú-u-wa-ar* (KBo. 1.45.1.7) : *wa-áš-šá-an-zi* 'they clothe', *ú-e-eš-ten*.

The supine suffixes *wanzi* and *wan* are also frequently preceded by a non-phonetic *u*; e. g. *wa-al-hu-u-an-zi* (KUB 14.1.66), *wa-al-ah-hu-wa-an-zi* (KBo. 5.8.1.8) *wa-al-ah-zi* 'he smites'; *wa-ar-pu-u-wa-an-zi* (Ehelolf, *KF* 1.155) : *wa-ar-ap-zi*; *ka-ri-pu-u-wa-an* (KBo. 3.1.1.21) : *ka-ra-ap-pí* 'he devours'; *tar-ah-hu-u-wa-an* (KBo. 3.7.3.25) : *tar-ah-zi* 'he conquers'.

Since the non-phonetic *u* is more frequent before the sign *wa* than before *w* written with a vowel sign, there are relatively few cases of this phenomenon in the first personal forms ending in *weni* or *wen*. I can cite only these: *še-ik-ku-u-e-ni* (KUB 5.7.1.26) = *še-ik-ku-e-ni* (KBo. 5.3.2.71), *4-ya-ah-ha-ah-hu-wa-ni* (KUB 9.4.2.35),¹⁶ *kar-ap-pu-u-e-ni* (Delaporte, *Gramm.* 68) : *kar-ap-zi*, *ešuwen* (ib. 65) : *e-eš-zi*.

In many words, however, orthographic *uwa*, *uwi*, etc. represent the pronunciation. This is due to recomposition in the frequent sentence opening *nu-wa-na-áš*, consisting of the connective *nu*, the particle of direct quotation *wa*, and the enclitic pronoun *naš* 'us', and in similar conglomerates. If I am right in connecting *huwiyami* 'I flee' with Lat. *fugio* on the basis of PIE **bhugwio*,¹⁷ the change of *gw* to *w* must have been subsequent to the change of *w* to *m* after *u*.

¹⁶ Cf. *pa-a-i-wa-ni* (KUB 9.34.3.33), *pa-i-wa-ni* (Yale Tablet 1.33 = TAPA 58.25), etc.

¹⁷ *Language* 3. 114, 219 f.

In numerous instances *w* after *u* has developed out of a consonantal glide. That this is so in *par-ku-u-eš-šú-un* (*KUB* 1. 1. 1. 39) 'I was acquitted' beside *par-ku-e-eš-zi* 'he is acquitted' from *parkuiš* 'pure' is shown by other derivatives in *eš* from *i*-stems, such as *nakkeš-* 'be heavy' from *nakkiš* 'heavy'.¹⁸ Similar are case-forms of *u*-stems (*genuwaš*, *aššuwaš*, *wappuwaš*) and derivative verbs in *a(i)* from *u*-stems (e. g. *ku-u-ut-ru-wa-iz-zi* 'he attests before witnesses' from *kutruš* 'witness').¹⁹

From verbs whose stem ends in *u* we find in the third plural present and in the participle such forms as these: *a-še-šá-nu-wa-an-zi* (*KBo.* 2. 6. 3. 45); *wa-ar-nu-wa-an-zi* as well as *wa-ar-nu-an-zi* 'they burn' beside the infinitival genitive *wa-ar-nu-ma-áš*; *hat-at-ki-eš-nu-wa-an-te-eš* 'destroyed' (*KBo.* 4. 4. 2. 5); *pa-ah-šá-nu-wa-an-za* 'protected' (*KBo.* 3. 57 = *2BoTU.* 20. 3. 9); *wa-ah-nu-wa-an* 'turned' beside *wa-ah-nu-mar*, *wa-ah-nu-ma-an-zi*. From *au-* 'see' we have noted *a-ú-me-en* 'we saw'; Forrer and Delaporte²⁰ report *aummeni* 'we see', of which *ú-me-e-ni* (*KBo.* 3. 60 = *2BoTU.* 21. 1. 11) seems to be a variant. From the same root we have *ú-wa-an-zi* 'they see' (*KUB* 13. 4. 3. 29), and middle forms such as *ú-wa-an-ta-at* (*KUB* 8. 80. 10), *ú-wa-ah-ha-ru* (*KUB* 14. 14. 2. 30).²¹

The numerous instances of *w* after *u* do not, then, disprove our prehistoric phonetic laws, according to which *uū* and *əu* became *um*. Some of these words have graphic *uw* for spoken *w*; in others the *w* is due to recomposition or to a phonetic development subsequent to the change of *uū* to *um*.

All of the suffixes which we have been examining in their Hittite form are extensively represented in IE also. To the infinitival nouns in *war* or *mar* correspond a few *r/n*-stems, such as *πεῖραρ* 'end' from **περφαρ*, *εἶδαρ* 'food' from **εδφαρ*, *λύμαρ* 'offscourings.' This type of noun, however, was on the point of disappearing at the beginning of our IE records, and so we

¹⁸ Cf. Götze, *KF* 1. 181.

¹⁹ See Götze, *Madd.* 81-100; Sturtevant, *Language* 5. 8-14.

²⁰ Forrer, *ZDMG* 76. 214; Delaporte, *Gramm.* 77.

²¹ Possibly some of the above forms should be read with *uwa* = *wa* (*parkwešun*, *parkwešzi*, etc.); but it is unlikely that the third plural of *au-* was *wanzi*, especially since the orthography **wa-an-zi-* is unknown. I am strongly inclined to assume dissyllabic pronunciation of *uwa* in all the words just discussed and in many others.

more often find neuter *yen-* or *men-*stems, e. g. *λύμα*, *πῶμα* 'drink', Skt. *parva* 'knot' (cognate with *πείραρ*), *agrādvān-* 'eating first' (*-advan-*: *είδαρ*). To match the infinitival genitives in *waš* or *maš* we find an oblique case (dative or locative) of *yen-* and *men-*stems; e. g. Cyprian *δόφεναι* (see below, fn. 25), Aeolic *δόμεναι* 'to give', Vedic *dāvane* 'to give', Avestan *stao-mainē* 'to praise'. The Hittite supine in *wan* or *man* must be another case-form of the same *r/n*-stem which yielded the infinitives. The supine in *wanzi* or *manzi* is a locative from the PIE suffix *uent* or *ment*.²² In the IE languages the suffixes *uent* and *ment* are almost confined to the formation of secondary adjectives, such as Skt. *apavant-* 'watery', *madhumant-* 'honied', Gk. *όπόεις* 'juicy'. The connection of *uent* and *ment* with *yen* and *men* is obvious,²³ however; the two pairs are virtually equivalent in their use to form adjectives, and the extension of suffixes by *t* is familiar in nouns as well as in adjectives (cf. Lat. *iuventa*=*iuventās*, Skt. *gurutā*=Gk. *βαρύτης*, Gk. *μνηστύς*: Lat. *virtūs*, Lat. *cōgnōmen*: *cōgnōmentum*, Gk. *όνομα*: *όνόματος*).

The IE languages show various endings in the first plural, but all the evidence indicates that the IE parent speech had endings beginning with *m*, which is certainly to be identified with the initial sound of Hittite *meni* (primary) and *men* (secondary). As is shown by Indo-Iranian, Germanic, and Balto-Slavic, IE had first dual endings beginning with *y*, which corresponds with the initial of Hittite *weni* and *wen*.

The distribution of the consonants *y* and *m* has been so far altered by analogy in the IE languages that the phonological basis of the alternation has not been recognized. Nevertheless there are indications that the situation here is an outgrowth of something very similar to what we find in Hittite.

Most striking is the affinity of the suffix *mant* for *u*-stems in Indo-Iranian. In Sanskrit *mant* is very rarely attached to *a*-stems, but it is more common than *vant* with *u*-stems. In Avestan *mant* is chiefly used with *u*-stems, while *vant* is chiefly confined to other types of noun.²⁴

²² For the change of *ti* to *zi*, see *Language* 4. 228-31.

²³ See Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 2, 1. 461, 465.

²⁴ See Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammār*, pp. 473-6; Jackson, *Avesta Grammar*, pp. 233, 235. See footnote 31, p. 369.

In primitive IE the suffix *men* largely supplanted the old by-form *uen* in forming action nouns; but there are a few survivals of the latter in infinitival function. Vedic *dāvane* and Cyprian *δοῖναι*²⁵ correspond perfectly with Hittite *dawar*. Aeolic *δόμεναι* must be an analogical adaptation of **δυμεναι*.²⁶ An interesting trace of the origin of the *men*-suffix is general Gk. *ὄνομα* 'name' from PIE **onumr̥*, earlier **onəur̥* (base *onō-*); the Attic-Ionic *ὄνομα* owes its second *o* to assimilation, and *u* remains in the compound *ἀνώνυμος*, since no *o* precedes. Lat. *nōmen*, and Skt. *nāma* represent PIE **nōur̥*, with the IE spread of the suffix-form *men*.

The personal endings beginning with *u* and *m* suffered a more thorough re-distribution during IE times. Everywhere the first plural has endings beginning with *m*, and wherever the first dual survives its ending begins with *u* (e. g. Skt. *ivas* 'we two go', *imas* 'we go').²⁷ Many of the historical forms may well have been inherited from PIE times (e. g. Gk. *ὀρνυμεν* 'we cause to move' = Hittite *ar-nu-um-me-ni*—*KUB* 4.1.2.6); but a majority of the plural forms and many of the dual forms must be analogical (e. g. Skt. *bhavāmas*, Gk. *λύομεν*).

There are, however, a few traces of our phonetic laws. We have noticed (above and fn. 26) that the first personal forms of **dō-* led to an infinitival noun **dumr̥*, whence Aeolic *δόμεναι*. The *u* spread beyond the forms with suffix in *u/m*, and yielded a new root with *nil*-grade *u* and analogical full grade *eu*, from which we get Lat. *duim*, *perduās*, Umbrian *purdouito* 'porricito', Lith. *daviau* 'I gave', etc.

Lat. *volumus* 'we desire' beside non-thematic *vult* and *vultis*

²⁵ This form is usually transcribed *δοῖναι*, on account of the *o* of Aeolic *δόμεναι*; but the long vowel which actually appears in the Vedic cognate is the only one that is phonologically justified. Attic-Ionic *δοῦναι* is from **doenai*, just as *θεῖναι* = Arcadian *θηῖναι* is from **theonai*; cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*, 411.

²⁶ This form itself was the result of analogy (see above, p. 362). It may have arisen at any time from the PIE period on; some such formula as this may represent the process (assuming that Hittite *tarna-* comes from a base *tornā-*): **t̥rnumen* (first pl.): **tornum_enai* = **dumen*: **dum_enai*.

²⁷ See Brugmann, *Grund.* 2₂. 3. 616 ff., 639 ff.

has required rather a complicated explanation.²⁸ I prefer to see in *volumus* the full grade ***uelā-* from a base *uelē-* (cf. Church Slavonic *velēti* 'to order', Doric *λην* 'to will' from **ελη-*).²⁹ In this word, as in the preceding, *u* spread beyond its proper territory, and so we have in Latin not only *volunt* for phonologically correct **velent* but also *volup* and *voluptās* 'pleasure'.

Since *m* for original *y* after *u* or *a* appears both in Hittite and in the IE languages, the change must be ascribed to the period before Hittite separated from the parent stock. The IE languages which preserve the formations here under discussion agree in two innovations that are not shared by Hittite; namely the use of *men* rather than *yen* in forming action nouns, and the assignment of personal endings beginning with *y* to the dual and of those beginning with *m* to the plural. It is so unlikely that the several languages would make just these changes independently that we must ascribe at least the earlier stages of the process to the parent language. But, since Hittite does not share them, Hittite must already have separated from the parent speech. This is one more proof of Forrer's discovery that Hittite is an offshoot of Pre-Indo-European co-ordinate with the Indo-European parent language.^{30, 31}

E. H. STURTEVANT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

²⁸ See Sommer, *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* 533.

²⁹ See Brugmann, *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik* 505, 611; Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque* 577 f. I do not share the skepticism expressed by Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 2. 393.

³⁰ See Forrer, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 61. 26; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, 14. 300-19; Sturtevant, *Language*, 2. 29-34, 4. 169 f.

³¹ The statistics published by Bender, *The Suffixes mant and vant in Sanskrit and Avestan* 11, 24, 27, show that the original distribution of these suffixes is more accurately preserved in Sanskrit than was stated above (p. 367). In Rīg-Veda and Atharva-Veda stems in *u*, *ū*, and *o* constitute more than half of all vowel stems with the suffix *mant*, while *vant* is used almost exclusively after *a* and *ā* and usually after *i*. On Avestan, see Bender, p. 81.

THREE ETYMOLOGIES IN EARLY CELTIC.

I. Gaulish *exacum*.

The Gaulish name for a variety of centaury is given by Pliny (*Hist. nat.* XXV, 68) as *exacum*: "Est alterum centaurium cognomine lepton . . . quod aliqui libadeon vocant . . . Quidam caules concisos madefaciunt diebus XVIII atque ita exprimunt. Hoc centaurium nostri fel terrae vocant propter amaritudinem summam, Galli *exacum*, quoniam omnia mala medicamenta potum e corpore exigit per alvum". Since the plant's name is so obviously described as based on its cathartic properties, the proposal¹ to connect *exaucum* (Gaulish nom. **exaucos*, acc. **exaucon*) with Mid. Bret. *eaug* < **ehaug*, Mod. Bret. *éok*, *éog* "ripe, rotting" as being for a Celtic **ex-āc-o-* "having lost its sharpness", because its macerated stalks were often soaked for days in water, seems scarcely probable.² If one may suppose that *exacum*, which occurs but once (apparently without variant readings), is erroneously written for **exagum*,³ the latter is seen to be the exact Gaulish equivalent of Lat. **exigus*: *exigo* < **ex-ago* (cf. Gaul. *ex-*, O. Ir. *ess-*, etc., Lat. *ex*; O. Ir. *agaim* "drive", Lat. *ago*).⁴ The form **exago-* shows that Celtic once possessed the same combination which appears in Latin *exigo* and Greek *ἐξάγω*. For the meaning of Gaul. **exago-* "purgative, cathartic" cf. Med. Lat. *exagium* "examen, purgatio, iudicium Dei" and Gk. *ἐξάγωγή* "ejectment" (legal term), "evacuation" (medical term).

¹ W. Stokes, *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*, Göttingen, 1894, p. 26; A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, Leipzig, 1896 sqq., I, 1487; E. Ernault, *Glossaire moyen-breton*, Paris, 1895, pp. 200-201; V. Henry, *Lexique étymologique . . . du breton moderne*, Rennes, 1900, p. 115. There seems to be no cogent evidence for *ā* rather than *ā* in the word.

² Like doubts were expressed by G. Dottin, *Manuel pour servir à l'étude de l'antiquité celtique*, 2d ed., Paris, 1915, p. 74.

³ Cf. Dottin, *La Langue gauloise*, Paris, 1920, p. 63, although, as he observes (cf. Holder, I, 650), in alternative writings with *c* and *g*, the former is generally original.

⁴ For further cognates see, e. g., A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2d ed., Heidelberg, 1910, pp. 260, 21.

II. The Name of the Isle of Man.

Regarding the Isle of Man, Nennius (*Hist. Brit.* 8) writes: "Secunda [insula] sita est in umbilico maris inter Hiberniam et Britanniam et vocatur nomen eius Eubonia, id est Manau"; the Mid. Ir. version (ed. J. H. Todd, Dublin, 1848, Chap. III) similarly has "Abonia . . . i. Manand". The more usual form of the second name is Mōna (also Mevania [insula], probably by transposition from *Menavia, *Manavia), Mōva, Mōva, Ang.-Sax. Mon-íg, Mid. Ir. Inis Manann;⁵ and Nennius clearly states that Eubonia and Manau are equivalent in meaning, so that one may have here two appellations for an island lying roughly half-way between Britain and Ireland, one Brythonic and the other Goidelic.

If the form Eubonia may be for *Ebonia [insula],⁶ this may represent an earlier *Eponia⁷ and may be connected with the wide-spread group of Gaul. *epo-*, O. Ir. *ech* "horse", O. Corn. *ebol*, Mid. Wel. *ebawl*, Mid. Bret. *ebeul* "colt" < **epāli-*;⁸ it would thus be a true Brythonic form. On the other hand, Manau appears to be as truly Goidelic. It represents O. Ir. *Manu* (Mod. Ir. *Mana*, gen. *Manann*, dat. *Manainn*) < **Mandien-*;⁹ and seems to be cognate with Lat. *mannus* "sort of horse", N. H. Germ. (Tyrolese) *Menz* "barren cow", etc., the ultimate source being non-Indo-European (cf. Basque *mando* "mule").¹⁰ **Mandien-* and **Eponio-* would seem to mean, in Goidelic and Brythonic respectively, "Horse-(Island)".¹¹

⁵ For the various forms and the passages in which they occur see Holder, II, 621-622.

⁶ Cf. Gaul. Ebonicus, Ebonius beside Eubona (Holder, I, 1394, 1483).

⁷ Cf. the Gaulish name Eponius (Holder, I, 1450).

⁸ Cf. H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1909-13, I, 36; II, 54; for cognates see Holder, I, 1446; Stokes, p. 26; Dottin, *Langue*, p. 98; Henry, p. 109; Walde, p. 257; Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1926 sqq., I, 113.

⁹ Cf. Pedersen, II, 110.

¹⁰ Holder, II, 409-410; Walde, p. 462; O. Schrader, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, 2d ed., Berlin, 1917-29, I, 41; II, 171; G. Meyer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*, Strassburg, 1891, p. 276.

¹¹ For a summary of other views see J. Kneen, *Place-Names of the Isle of Man*, Douglas, 1925-27, I, pp. xxii-xxiv.

III. The Name of Les Andelys (Eure).

Grand Andely, about one kilomètre from the Seine, is older by six hundred years than its neighbour Petit Andely, and is mentioned early in the sixth century in the *Vita Sanctae Chrotildis*, 11, where the saint "fecit et aliud monasterium super fluvium Sequane in loco qui dicitur Andeleius non longe a muris civitatis Rotomagensis". This name Andeleius is most probably for *Andelēgius < *Andelēkios, and is composed of the intensive Celtic prefix *ande- (Gaul. *ande-*, O. Ir. *ind-*, O. Bret. *an-*, Wel. *an-, en-*)¹² with *lēṽṽkio-, an adjective formed on the noun *lēṽṽk-s, found in O. Ir. *lia* (gen. *liac[c]*), Bret. *liac'h* "stone", cognate with Hom. *λαίγξ* "little stone", *λαίφος* "stony", *λαῶς* "stone".¹³ The Gallo-Latin name would, then, have been *Andelēcius [vicus] "Town of the Mighty Stone", deriving its appellation from the high cliff overhanging the Seine, which is still crowned by the ruins of Château Gaillard, the "lovely daughter of a year" of Richard the Lion-Hearted.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

STATIUS: *SILVAE* III. v. 93.

Various scholars have felt, and rightly so, that there has been some flaw in the transmission of this line: it creates a dissonance in the famous description of Neapolitan amenities:

- 89 Quid nunc magnificas species cultusque locorum
 90 templaque <et> innumeris spatia interstincta columnis,
 et geminam molem nudi tectique theatri,
 et Capitolinis quinquennia proxima lustris,
 quid laudem litus libertatemque Menandri,
 quam Romanus honos et Graia licentia miscent?
 95 nec desunt variae circa oblectamina vitae:
 sive vaporiferas, blandissima litora, Baias, . . .

¹² Holder, I, 139, 144; III, 614 (the etymology proposed by him seems open to grave doubt); Pedersen, I, 45; II, 10; for variant forms, including Andelegum, Andeliacus, see de Blosseville, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de l'Eure*, Paris, 1878, p. 5; for older etymologies see Porée, *Guide du touriste aux Andelys*, 2d ed., Les Andelys, 1893, p. 7.

¹³ Cf. Pedersen, I, 251; Walde, p. 419; Boisacq, pp. 546-547; Walde-Pokorny, II, 405-406; Ernault, pp. 365-366; Henry, p. 186.

The fault surely does not lie in *Menandri* (although Phillimore thought so and was attracted by the conjecture *meandi*, and Grasberger proposed *morandi*), but in *litus*; and for this word a sounder means of correction lies to hand than the *lites*, *lusus*, *risus*, and *ritus* that have been suggested. Restore *ludos*; the corruption can easily be explained, as confusion between *d* and *t*, *o* and *u*, is frequent, and if the *li-* was not due to the first syllable of *libertatemque* which follows, then after the end of *ludos* had been corrupted to *-tus*, a puzzled reader may have been influenced to make sense by his eye's glancing at the *litora* of line 96. The *hendiadys* which results from our restoration is quite in the manner of Statius, and would have been considered a felicitous mode of describing "the vivacious plays of Menander."

Thus restored, the whole passage acquires unity and coherence. Starting with the matter of buildings in general in line 89, and temples and colonnades in 90, the interest is concentrated in 91 on the theatres, and in 92 it is focussed on the festivals of which they were, at least in part, the scene, until in 93 and 94 there is reached the climax, describing the plays of Menander which were the quintessence of truly Roman dignity blended with Greek audacity (*licentia*, which if applied to conduct would be opprobrious, is in place as a term of literary criticism)—a contrast to the *clamosi turba theatri* of the Capital, which had been disparaged in line 16; the progression of interest is from the material to the intellectual. The repetition of *quid* from line 89 to 93 serves to keep lines 93 and 94 in close connection with what precedes; it is only with the *nec desunt* of 95 that there is a sharp change in the subject-matter.

This emendation appears to render it unnecessary to have recourse to the extremely subtle interpretations which are recorded in Vollmer's commentary.

A. W. VANBUREN.

AN EARLY USE OF THE ACCENTUAL CLAUSULA

A chance observation a few weeks ago has brought up again the fascinating problem of the origin of the accentual clausula in Latin prose. In revising Clark and Game's "First Latin," for a new edition, I am proceeding on the now apparently discarded theory that children should learn Latin by reading some real Latin, and not altogether stories constructed in a dubious American version of what little Willie saw in Rome. With this out-dated method in mind, I took up Petronius, again relishing his comment on the modern pedagogical methods of his day: "nisi (doctores) dixerint quae adulescentuli probent, ut ait Cicero, 'soli in scholis relinquentur.'" In my search for material suitable for *adulescentuli*, I was struck by what seemed an unmistakable lilt to the rhythm. To my astonishment, a vast majority of the clause-endings fell into the forms with which I was familiar from early studies in Ammianus Marcellinus and other prose writers from the fourth century onward, on which Prof. A. M. Harmon of Yale produced a classic thesis. I rubbed my eyes, sure I must be mistaken; but more careful study, and comparison with Livy, Tacitus and others, brought conviction that Petronius had dallied, at least, with the rhetorical device which has embellished prose writing from that Roman History of old Ammian to Blackmore's Lorna Doone, to take a conspicuous modern example.

The life of a traveling lecturer, who for ten years has averaged 35,000 miles a year, and whose scanty leisure for sustained study is spent mainly in a remote (if lovely) Canadian village, does not encourage keeping abreast of current research in such problems. It seemed incredible that this phenomenon had not been investigated in detail by some competent scholar. My appeals, however, to former colleagues and pupils in this country, more fortunately situated, brought no definite information—indeed, led to a warning from one of them that the learned world would consider me unbalanced. But before I left my lakeside dwelling in Quebec, I had received encouragement from my good friend Wilhelm Heraeus, who called my attention to the suspicion previously voiced by the distinguished professor of Corpus Christi

College, Oxford—A. C. Clark; and almost in the same mail came a letter from A. C. Clark himself, enclosing a copy of his paper, "The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin," read to the Oxford Philological Society on Feb. 18, 1910. In this most stimulating study, Clark not only quotes a long passage from Petronius, in which every clausula save one falls into this cadence, but even a letter of Cicero's unexceptionable in this regard.

Nearly twenty years have passed since this study of A. C. Clark's, and I find no evidence of serious investigation along these lines, whose extraordinary fruitfulness may be judged by reference to Harmon's thesis, pronounced in its day by a distinguished critic "a veritable gold mine of facts about the Latin language." A young German scholar, to be sure, Paul Kempe, writing at Greifswald in 1922, brought out a study "De Clausulis Petronianis"; and thanks to the friendly offices of Prof. David M. Robinson of Johns Hopkins, I am able to quote from the published abstract of his dissertation. This is a tabulation of the *quantitative* clausulae; he dismisses the efforts of A. C. Clark to prove *accentual* rhythm in Petronius with the words: "den sogenannten cursus mixtus des 4. nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts bereits . . . bei Petron anzusetzen . . . halte ich für ausgeschlossen." These, by the way, are almost the exact words in which Krumbacher years ago endeavored to dissuade me from setting a promising pupil at work on Procopius, whose Gothic History seemed to me composed in this rhythm; I could not however be convinced, and Henry B. Dewing published a Yale thesis on this theme, as valuable in the light it threw on the late Greek as was Harmon's in the field of Latin.

Unfortunately the brief and hurried time at my disposal the past few weeks has not permitted the exhaustive treatment of this subject, on which I had hoped to present a summary. Such a treatment, pending the appearance of Prof. Sage's edition, would necessarily begin with a thorough study of the text, requiring perhaps even a recollection; I note, e. g., two or three cases where restoration of the best MS reading would give a correct accentual clausula, not at present in the accepted text. Without such a fundamental background, all investigation must be tentative; it is like dealing with a text of Virgil whose editor is skeptical of the hexameter. Kempe is probably correct in postu-

lating a different rhetorical treatment by Petronius of conversational passages as contrasted with narrative. That needs further investigation. The whole problem of the chance coincidence of quantitative and accentual clausulae must be studied exhaustively. One must also take into account the use of elision and hiatus. Ammianus, e. g., does not permit elision in the clausulae; but even cursory examination indicates that Petronius does—a fact apparently not utilized by A. C. Clark; nor does he seem to appreciate that *i* and *u* may be either consonantal or vocalic, as in late Latin.

With this brief indication, therefore, I must lay aside this subject till fate permits a long and uninterrupted stay at some seat of learning; meanwhile I commend it to some ambitious student as likely to lead to surprising and interesting results, which may usher in a new conception of the technique of Latin prose writing in the earlier centuries of our era.

In closing, I would quote a page from the Heraeus-Buecheler fifth edition (p. 72), in which, instead of commas, etc., I use 1, 2 and 3, indicating respectively the *cursus planus*, the *cursus tardus* and the *cursus velox*, and an asterisk for apparently irregular clausulae:

"Hi sunt" inquit Giton 1) "quos fugimus" 2) simulque raptim 1) causas odiorum 1) et instans periculum 2) trepidanti Eumolpø exponit 1) Confusus ille et consilii egens iubet 1) quemque suam sententiam promere 2) et "Fingite" inquit 1) "nos antrum Cyclopis intrasse 1) Quaerendum est aliquod effugium 3) nisi naufragium ponimus 2) et omni nos periculo liberamus 3)" "Immo" inquit Giton 1) "persuade gubernatori 3) ut in aliquem portum 1) navem deducat 1) Non sine praemio scilicet 2) et affirma ei impatientem maris fratrem tuum in ultimis esse 1) Poteris hanc simulatjonem 1) et vultus confusione 3) et lacrimis obumbrare 3) ut misericordja permotus 1) gubernator indulgeat tibi 1)" Negavit hoc Eumolpus fieri posse 1) "Quia magna" inquit "navigia 2) portubus se curvatis insinuant 2) nec tam cito fratrem defecisse veri simile erit * Accedit his quod forsitan Lichas officii causa 1) visere languentem desiderabit 3) Vides quam valde nobis expediat 2) ultro dominum ad fugientes accersere 2) Sed finge navem ab ingenti posse cursu deflecti 1) et Licham non utique 2) circumiturum

aegrorum cubilia 2) quomodo possumus egredi nave 1) ut non conspiciamur a cunctis 1) Opertis capitibus an nudis * Opertis—et quis non dare manum languentibus volet 1) Nudis—et quid erit aliud 2) quam se ipsos proscribere 2)” “Quin potius” inquam ego “ad temeritatem confugimus 2) et per funem lapsi descendimus 2) in scapham * praecisoque vinculo 2) reliqua fortunae committimus 2) Nec ego in hoc periculum Eumolpon arcesso 1) Quid enim attinet innocentem 3) alieno periculø imponere 2) Contentus sum si nos descendentes 1) adiuverit casus 1)” “Non imprudens” inquit “consilium” Eumolpos 1) “si aditum haberet 1) Quis enim non euntes notabit 1) Utique gubernator 3) qui pervigil nocte 1) siderum quoque motus custodit 1) Et utcunque imponi nihil dormienti posset * si per aliam partem navis fuga quaereretur 3) nunc per puppim * per ipsa gubernacula delabendum est 3) a quorum regione funis descendit 1) qui scaphae custodiam tenet 1) Praeterea illud miror Encolpi 1) tibi non succurrisse 3) unum nautam stationis perpetuae 2) interdiu noctuque iacere in scapha * nec posse inde custodem 1) nisi aut caede expelli * aut praecipitari viribus 2) Quod an fieri posset 1) interrogate audaciam vestram 1) Nam quod ad meum quidem comitatum attinet * nullum recuso periculum 2) quod salutis spem ostendit 1)

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

ORIENTAL ELEMENTS IN PETRONIUS.

The art of Petronius in suiting language to character has often been noticed.¹ It has been pointed out, for example, that the Greeks in the Cena are recognizable by peculiarities in their speech.² On the other hand, Professor Tenney Frank's calculations have demonstrated the preponderance of the Oriental element in the Rome and Italy of the early Empire.³ Trimalchio himself proclaims his Asiatic origin,⁴ and we should certainly expect that some of his guests were similarly derived. If Petronius is as skilful a realist in suiting his speeches to his characters as his critics have shown him to be, we might logically expect to find certain Oriental elements in the speech of the guests at the Cena.

The process of assimilation whereby the Easterners took on the habits and speech of Rome went on constantly,⁵ yet traces of Eastern origin must have persisted for two or more generations, in idiom if not in pronunciation, and in habits of thought if not in outward behaviour. Organization of foreign groups according to ethnic origins⁶ would tend to perpetuate racial peculiarities. Conversation among peoples of foreign extraction in New York is apt to betray foreign traces, and the same condition must have prevailed in Rome. I submit for consideration the following examples from the *Satyricon*:⁷

¹ F. F. Abbott, *The Use of Language as a Means of Characterization in Petronius*, *Classical Philology* II (1907), 43-50.

² Abbott, *loc. cit.*; A. H. Salenius, *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis*, Helsingfors and Leipzig 1927 (known to me only through the review of G. Meyer in *Gnomon* V (1929), 144-150).

³ Race Mixture in the Roman Empire, *American Historical Review* XXI (1915-1916), 689-708; and *Economic History of Rome*, ch. X.

⁴ *Satyricon* 29. 3, 75. 10.

⁵ For instances of assimilation through Romanization of names, see Mary L. Gordon, *The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire*, *Journal of Roman Studies* XIV (1924), 93-111.

⁶ See especially George LaPiana, *Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire*, *Harvard Theological Review* XX (1927), 183-403.

⁷ I am not here considering oriental affinities of the romance as a whole, such as are suggested by Karl Kerenyi, *Die Griechisch-Orienta-*

26.9 Trimalchio. Friedlaender⁸ cites the opinion of Bücheler that the name is Semitic. There can be little doubt that *-malchio* represents the root מלך, which is frequently used like its equivalent *rex* for a very wealthy or elegant person; the *tri-* is an intensive prefix as in *trifur*, *trismegistus*.

31.2 Vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est. Friedlaender puts the emphasis on *dominicum*: "Die gratia ministratoris besteht darin, dass er vinum dominicum, nicht einen geringeren vorsetzt." But in Babylonian Talmud, Baba Kama 92b, an Aramaic proverb occurs: "The wine is the master's, the thanks the butler's."⁹ Our passage seems to be simply a parallel of this proverb.

34.8 Potantibus . . . larvam argenteam attulit servus. Though the famous Bosco Reale cup shows the skeleton used as an ornamental design, with probably the same purpose of serving as a *memento mori*, the origin of the custom is almost certainly Eastern. Herodotus II 78 says that wealthy Egyptians had skeletons brought in at their banquets, and Plutarch, whose testimony may be independent, also refers to this practise.¹⁰ The *memento mori* motive in connection with the enjoyment of food and drink is frequent in Scriptures: Isaiah 22. 13, 56. 12; Eccles. 2. 24; Luke 12. 19; I Cor. 15. 32.

35. On this chapter Sage¹¹ remarks that Trimalchio's "exactness in astrology is amazing when we think of his capacity for blundering in history, geography, and mythology." It is of course what we should expect of an Oriental.

37.8 nummorum nummos; cf. 43.8 olim oliorum. This usage is often explained as a Hebraism (e. g. by Friedlaender) on the analogy of *Song of Songs*, *Vanity of vanities*, *Heaven of heavens*, etc. Suess says categorically:¹² "Nil exstat in his sermonibus, quod merito possit ad auctoritatem patrii sermonis

lische Romanliteratur, Tübingen, 1927; of this work see Indices IV and VI.

⁸ L. Friedlaender, *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis etc.*,² Leipzig 1906.

⁹ חמרא למריה טיביתא לשקיה

¹⁰ Sept. Sap. Conviv. 148 A, quoted in the Petronius edition of P. Burmann (Amsterdam 1743), p. 194.

¹¹ Evan T. Sage, *Petronius, The Satiricon*, New York and London 1929.

¹² Guilelmus Suess, *Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina*, Dorpat 1927, p. 8.

syriaci aut hebraici revocari." He adduces parallels to the present usage from Vergil, *Catalepton* 5. 6, and Varro, *L. L.* VII 27, neither of which seems convincing.

37. 10 *Babaecalis*. No satisfactory explanation of this word has been offered. Mr. Sedgwick reports:¹³ "Mr. Ulric Gantillon suggests that the word may be a pretentious and derogatory inflation of the Persian *beg* (Turkish *bey*)." However that may be I feel sure that this word as well as *burdubasta* (45. 11; see below) and perhaps *tangomenas* (34. 7 and 73. 6) are transliterated Oriental words. I would call attention to the late Professor W. R. Newbold's article, *Five Transliterated Aramaic Inscriptions*,¹⁴ and especially to his interpretation of *C. I. L.* IV 760,¹⁵ where he makes the unintelligible letters TCLOfTORGC into Aramaic words quite in keeping with the obscenity of the Latin part of the inscription, and quite worthy of one of Trimalchio's guests.

37. 10 *In rutae folium*. Martial XI 13. 5 makes it clear that this expression is a proverbial one for small size. "A leaf of myrtle" is frequently used in a similar sense in rabbinic writings.¹⁶ The leaves of rue and myrtle are not dissimilar.

38. 13 *Sociorum olla male fervet*. An exact parallel to this proverb in *Erubin* 3a and *Baba Batra* 24b has been pointed out by W. Bacher:¹⁷ "A pot which is the common property of a number of partners is neither cold nor hot."¹⁸ Friedlaender corrects the note of his first edition on the basis of this suggestion.

41. 3 *Servus tuus*. The use of this phrase by a free person for the sake of politeness seems unparalleled in Latin. It is the regular Hebrew usage. The lexicon of Brown, Driver, Briggs, s. v. עבֶר 6 says: "In polite address of equals or superiors the Hebrews used עבֶר = *tuus servus thy servant* = 1 person sing. *I*". Examples are cited from *Genesis* 18. 3, *I Sam.* 20. 7, 8, *II Kings* 8. 13, etc.

41. 12 *Matus*. The usual explanation of this word is that

¹³ W. B. Sedgwick, *Classical Review* XXXIX (1925), p. 117.

¹⁴ In *American Journal of Archaeology* XXX (1926), pp. 288-329.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

¹⁶ דאסא bHullin 47b, and elsewhere.

¹⁷ In *Jewish Quarterly Review* IV (1892), pp. 168-170.

¹⁸ קרירא רבי שותפי לא קרירא ולא חמימא

of e. g. Sedgwick:¹⁹ "vulg. for *madidus*, itself slang." \sqrt{MT} is the common Semitic root for *died*, *dead*, *corpse* (*met*, *mit*, *mat*, for Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic respectively). Is not this the sort of expression that might continue, in a Latinized form, in the speech of Trimalchio and his associates?

42.2 Cor nostrum cotidie liquescit. This seems to be a Semitic conceit. Cf. Joshua 7.5: "Wherefore the hearts of the people melted and became as water." Psalms 22.14: "I am poured out like water: my heart also in the midst of my body is even like melting wax."

42.2 Nec sane lavare potui; fui enim hodie in funus. Roman usage did not forbid a mourner to wash, and the present passage seems to indicate some sort of ritual prohibition rather than simply preoccupation. Such a prohibition does occur in the Talmud, Moed Katan 15b: "A mourner may not wash".²⁰ Furthermore prohibition of bathing, as well as of certain other physical comforts, was always understood as being involved in any fast.

44.3 Serva me, servabo te. Similar expressions may be found in all languages, as for example our "Scratch my back and I'll scratch yours"; but Baba Mezia 80a has a literal version of the present passage.²¹

44.14 Nunc populus est domi leones, foras vulpes. This antithesis occurs frequently in Greek, being found as far back as Aristophanes, Pax 1189. It may be worth mentioning, however, that the proverbial expression seems implied in a passage in the Talmud, Baba Kama 117b: "The lion you spoke of [when he was at a great distance] has turned into a fox [now that he is here]."²² The rabbis frequently use "lion" to denote a distinguished or worthy person,²³ and *leones* in 44.4 is a parallel to this usage: "o si haberemus illos leones, quos ego hic inveni, cum primum ex Asia veni."

44.17 Nemo ieiunium servat. Fasting was rare among the Romans and the *ieiunium Cereris* appears to be the only fast

¹⁹ W. B. Sedgwick, *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius*, Oxford 1925.

²⁰ אבל אסור כרחיצה

²¹ שמור לי ואשמור לך

²² ארי שאמרת נעשה שועל

²³ M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud, etc.*, I, p. 118.

that was kept annually, so that Friedlaender can say, "Vielleicht stand im Original: Nemo Cereris jejunium servat." To Eastern peoples fasting was very familiar. The Pharisees fasted on Mondays and Thursdays and on numerous special occasions. An entire treatise of the Talmud, Taanit,²⁴ is devoted to the regulation of fast days, especially those proclaimed for seasons of drouth.

44. 18 Iovem aquam exorabant: itaque statim urceatim plo-
vebat. The following story from Taanit was widely known, and
may conceivably have been in the mind of the speaker: "Honi
the Circle-drawer was therefore asked to pray that rain should
fall. . . . He then drew a circle and placed himself in its
center, and said . . . 'I swear by Thy great Name that I will
not move from here until Thou showest mercy to Thy chil-
dren'. . . . The rain then came down with vehemence, each
drop as big as the opening of a barrel."²⁵

45. 8 Sed qui asinum non potest stratum caedit. The
identical proverb is found in the Midrash, Tanhuma P'kude 4.²⁶

45. 11 Burdubasta. The exact phonetic transliteration of
this word into Aramaic gives the meaning "pit of shameful-
ness".²⁷ This explanation of this word seems to me more
plausible than any heretofore suggested.

46. 8 Primigeni. This not uncommon slave name is per-
haps a reflection of the special privileges accorded to the first-
born son among Semitic peoples.²⁸ Here it may not be a proper
name, but used as in the address of Jacob to Reuben, Genesis
49. 3: "Reuben, thou art my firstborn, my might, and the
beginning of my strength."

46. 8 Quidquid discis tibi discis. Cf. Proverbs 9. 12: "If
thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself."

47. 1 Unguento manus lavit. Burmann comments: ²⁹ "non

²⁴ This treatise is excellently edited and translated in the Schiff
Library of Jewish Classics, by H. Malter, Philadelphia 1928.

²⁵ The translation is that of Malter, *op. cit.*, pp. 167 f.

²⁶ מִי שֶׁאֵינוּ יָכוֹל לִהְיוֹת לַחֲמוֹד מִכָּה אֶת הָאוֹכֶה

²⁷ בּוֹר רִבְשָׁתָא

²⁸ S. A. Cook in *Encyc. Biblica*, s. v. Firstborn (II 1525). The word
constituted an honorable title among the Semites; see W. Robertson
Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*², pp. 458 ff.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

succurrat similis luxuriae exemplum." The Mischa mentions the custom of scenting the hands at meals by means of incense passed on a brazier.³⁰ Lavish use of perfumery is characteristic of Eastern countries; scriptural references illustrating such use (though not for the washing of hands) are: Canticles 3.6; Proverbs 7.17; Psalms 45.9; Luke 7.46.

52.3 Petraitis. Sedgwick notes:³¹ "Cognomen of Lycian god *Men*, Lebas-W 668, 676—CIA 3.73. But here no doubt for *Tetraites* who occurs as gladiator five times in inscriptions coupled with *Prudens*." Perhaps the confusion of names is in itself significant.

57.8 In alio peduculum vides, in te ricinum non vides. Cf. Matthew 7.5: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." Also, Luke 6.41.³²

65.5 Habinnas. The name in this form does not occur in C. I. L., but *Abinnerici* (gen.) does occur (IV 2585, 2599, 2600, 2601), and its recurrence in Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XX 22 (Niese) as *'Αβενήριος* establishes its Syrian or Jewish origin. Several Talmudic sages were called *Abina* or *Abin*.³³ Furthermore the name *Abban* (*'Αββάνης*, *'Αμβανής*) occurs in the apocryphal Acts of Thomas, which is proven to be of Syriac origin. Professor F. C. Burkitt declared the name to be Semitic,³⁴ and subsequently proves his guess.³⁵

68.8 Recutitus est. Perhaps a conscious disparagement by

³⁰ Berakhot VI 6; cf. Jastrow, *op. cit.*, II, p. 738.

³¹ W. B. Sedgwick, *Classical Review* XXXIX (1925), p. 118.

³² Many rabbinic parallels are cited in Strack und Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1922, I, p. 446.

³³ Jewish Encyc. I, pp. 63-64.

³⁴ *Journal of Theological Studies* I (1900), p. 288.

³⁵ *Ibid.* II (1901), p. 429: "In a Latin papyrus dated 166 A. D. and published among the Palaeographical Society's Facsimiles (Series II, plate 190), we learn that C. Fabullius Macer, a lieutenant in the Imperial Fleet of triremes on the Tigris, bought a seven-year-old slave who came from the country beyond the river and answered to the name of *Abban* or *Eutyches* (*Puerum natione transfuminianum nomine Abban quem Eutychen sive quo alio nomine vocatur [sic]*). The name of the slave is obviously identical with that of the merchant who bought the Apostle Thomas to be a carpenter."

one who considered himself advanced beyond a barbaric practise. The practise is always associated with Jews; cf. 102. 14 *circumcide nos ut iudaei videamur*, and Frag. 37 (Bücheler).³⁶

69. 9 *De fimo facta sunt*. "A favorite oriental trick according to Sir R. Burton," Sedgwick.³⁷

72. 10 *Nemo unquam convivarum per eandem ianuam emissus est, alia intrant alia exeunt*. Cf. Ezekiel 46. 9: "But when the people of the land shall come before the Lord in the solemn feasts, he that entereth in by way of the north gate to worship shall go out by way of the south gate; and he that entereth by the way of the south gate shall go forth by the way of the north gate: he shall not return by the way of the gate whereby he came in, but shall go forth over against it."³⁸ Apparently Trimalchio's notion of elegance in this regard is ultimately derived from the Temple arrangement or something cognate.

74. 12 *Urceolum frigidum ad malam eius admovit*. Yoma 78a: "Raba used to cool himself on Atonement Day with the outside of a vessel of water."

77. 4 *Cusuc*. Mr. Sedgwick remarks:³⁹ "It is no doubt Eastern. Mr. Gantillon sends me the following note: 'Cusuc is the Persian *kushk*, a light Summer palace, pavilion, portico. In Turkish it became *kosk*, pronounced *kyosk*, whence the French *kiosque*. Trimalchio says: "*Cusuc erat, nunc templum est*." The word must have brought with it into the slang of his day both the sense of flimsiness and of the promise of a more pretentious building, temple or palace.'"

80. 1 *Age, inquit, nunc et puerum dividamus: iocari putabam discedentem: at ille gladium paricidali manu strinxit*. H. Lucas⁴⁰ recognizes in this a version of the Judgment of Solomon, but says that it is derived through a Greek source. R. Engelmann⁴¹ enumerates no less than five examples of the repre-

³⁶ See Theodore Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris 1895, Index s. v. *circumcision*.

³⁷ W. B. Sedgwick, *Classical Review* XXXIX (1925), p. 118.

³⁸ The Code of Maimonides, under *Hilkhoth Tefila*, prescribes that all synagogues have two entrances.

³⁹ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁰ *Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds 60. jährigem Geburtstag*, p. 269.

⁴¹ *Ein neues Urtheil Salomonis und die Friesbilder der Casa Tiberina*, *Hermes* XXXIX (1904), pp. 146-154.

sensation of the Judgment of Solomon in Roman art, and I do not see why the story cannot have migrated directly without Greek intervention.

94. 1 O felicem, inquit, matrem tuam, quae te talem peperit. Cf. Luke 11. 27: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked."

105. 4 Placuit quadragenas utrique plagas imponi. Forty stripes is regularly the maximum corporal punishment in all rabbinic legal writings, on the basis of Deuteronomy 25. 3: "Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed."

111. The possibility that the origin of the story of the Widow of Ephesus is ultimately Oriental has been widely recognized. I would add that three versions of the story, in details apparently independent of each other and of our text, are extant in medieval Hebrew literature, ranging in date from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries.⁴² Perhaps this may indicate a persistent independent tradition, from which Petronius may have drawn directly.

MOSES HADAS.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

⁴² Cf. I. Davidson's edition of Joseph Zabara, *Sepher Shaashuim*, New York 1914, pp. lii ff.

TWO PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF HOMER.

The two papyri published below were added to the collection at Columbia University in July, 1929. The passages of Homer represented seem to be contained in no other published papyri, and the Odyssey fragment gives textual evidence of considerable interest.

P. Columbia Inv. no. 496. 7" x 3". Third Century A. D.¹

Iliad V, 857-878.

- νεῖα[τ]ον ες [κενεωνα οθι ζωννυσκετο μιτρη]
 τη ρα μιν ο[υ]τα τυχων δια δε χροα καλον εδαψεν
 δε
 εκ δορυ σπάσε[ν] αυτις ο δ εβραχε χαλκεος αρης]
 860 οσσον τ εννε[αχιλοι επιαχον η δεκαχιλοι]
 ανερες εν π[ολεμω εριδα ξυναγοντες αρης]
 τους δ αρ ὑπο [τρομος ειλεν αχαιους τε τρωας τε]
 δεισαντας το[σον εβραχ αρης ατος πολεμοιο]
 ὅλη δ εκ νεφέω[ν ερεβεννη φαινεται αηρ]
 865 καυματος εξ α[νεμοιο δυσταεος ορνυμενοιο]
 τοιος τυδείδη δ[ιομηδει χαλκεος αρης]
 φαινεθ[ο]μον υ[εφεεσσιν ιων εις ουρανον ευρυν]
 καρπαλιμω[ς] δ ικανε θεων εδος αιπυν ολυμπον]
 πα[ρ] δε δι κρ[ονιωνι καθεζετο θυμον αχευων]
 870 δειξεν δ α[μ]βρ[οτον αιμα καταρρεον εξ ωτειλῆς]
 [κ]αι ρ ολο[φ]υρ[ομενος επεα πτεροεντα προσηυδα]
 [ζευ] πα[τερ ου νεμεσιζη ορων ταδε καρτερα εργα]
 [αιε]ι τοι [ριγιστα θεοι τετληοτες ειμεν]
 [αλ]ληλων [ιοτητι χαριν ανδρεσσι φεροντες]
 875 [σοι] παντ[ες] μαχομεσθα συ γαρ τεκες αφρονα κουρην]
 [ουλο]μεν[ην η τ αιεν αησυλα εργα μεμηλεν]

¹ The dates given are those assigned to these fragments by Mr. H. Idris Bell of the British Museum.

[αλλ]οι μεν γαρ παντες οσοι θεοι εισ εν ολυμπω]

[σοι τ] επιπε[ιθονται και δεδμημεσθα εκαστος]

The fragment is tattered, and now in three pieces. A small, angular book hand is used, somewhat similar to that of P. Berlin 7499,² but with narrower letters written with a finer pen. The spaces at the top and bottom show that we have here portions of all the (22) lines of the column. At this rate Book V must have occupied a little over 41 columns. One letter, a ν, at the end of a line in the previous column is visible; it is opposite line 873, and therefore must be the last letter of 851. Iota adscript appears to be omitted in 858 τη, but in 866 τυδειδη it is impossible to determine. In 859 δε has been inserted above the line, apparently by a different hand, in a rather sprawling script, and with a thicker pen and paler ink. In 864 the η of οιη is small and crowded in above the line; it was evidently inserted later, probably by the same hand. There are no variants from the accepted text.

P. Columbia Inv. no. 514. 6½" x 1¾". Second Century A. D.

Odyssey XVII, 331-355.

[κειμενον ε]νθα δε δαι[τρος εφιζεσκε κρεα πολλα]

[δαιομενος μ]νηστηρσ[ι δομον κατα δαινυμενοισιν]

[τον κατεθηκ]ε φερων προ[ς τηλεμαχοιο τραπεζαν]

[αντιον ενθα δ α]ρ αυτος εφεζετ[ο τωι δ αρα κηρυξ]

335 [μοιραν ελων προ]τιθει κανεου τ [εκ σιτον αιρας]

[αγχιμολον δε μ]ετ αυτον εδυσατ[ο δωματ οδυσσευς]

[πτωχωι λευγαλ]εωι εναλιγκιος η[δε γεροντι]

[σκηπτομενος] τα δε λυγρα περι χ[ροι ειματα εστο]

[ιξε δ επι μελινο]ν ουδου εντοσ[θε θυραων]

340 [κλιναμενος σταθ]μωι κυπαρισσ[ινωι ον ποτε τεκτων]

[ξεσσεν επισταμ]ενως και επι [σταθμην ιθυνεν]

[τηλεμαχος δ επι ο]ι καλεσας προ[σσειπε συβωτην]

[αρτον τ ουλον ελ]ων περικα[λλεος εκ κανεοιο]

² Berl. Class. Texte V, 1; see W. Schubart, *Griech. Palaeographie*, p. 137, fig. 93.

- [και χρεας ως οι χειρ]ες εχανδα[νον αμφιβαλονται]
 345 [δος τωι ξεινωι ταυ]τα φερων αυτον τ[ε κελευει]
 [αιτιζειν μαλα πα]ντας εποικομε[νον μνηστηρας]
 [αιδως δ ουκ αγαθη] κεχρημενωι ανδ[ρι παρειναι]
 [ως φατο βη δε συφ]ορβος επει τον μ[υθον ακουσεν]
 [αγχου δ ισταμενο]ς επεα πτεροεντ [αγορευεν]
 350 [τηλεμαχος τοι ξ]εινε διδοι ταδε κ[αι σε κελευει]
 [αιτιζειν μαλα παν]τας εποικομεν[ον μνηστηρας]
 [αιδως δ ουκ αγαθ]η φησ εμμεναι αν[δρι προικτη]
 [τον δ απαμειβομ]ενος προσεφη π[ολουμητις οδυσσευσ]
 [ξεν ανα τηλεμαχο]ν δος εν ανδρασ[ιν ολβιον ειναι]
 355 [και οι παντα γενοιθ ο]σσα φρεσισησι μ[ενοιται]

This also is a strip containing parts of all the (25) lines of a column; Book XVII evidently occupied a little more than 24 such columns. The script is round and formal, resembling that of P. Berlin 9739.³ Iota adscript is used in 337 λευγαλ]εωι, 340 σταθ]μωι, 347 κεχρημενωι, and 355 ηισι.

331. The fragment agrees with all other mss. in the reading δε; Bekker's emendation to τε has been generally accepted.

335. The first visible letter, though only the right side of it remains, was obviously ο, not ε; the papyrus therefore agrees at this point with the mss. which read προτιθει, not ετιθει. This fact is confirmed by the space.

336. There is again a division among the mss.; the fragment clearly read εδυσατο, not εδυσετο.

347. The papyrus agrees with the great majority of the mss. in reading κεχρημενωι ανδρι rather than κεχρημενον ανδρα.

352. Of the first letter only the extreme right side is visible; this is a distinctly curved vertical line. As the last vertical line of ν is invariably straight in this fragment, while the last line of η is always curved, we can be certain that the reading here was αγαθη, not αγαθην.

³ See W. Schubart, *P. Graec. Berol.* 19a; *Griech. Palaeographie*, p. 115.

354. Here we find an entirely new variant. All the other mss. read *μοι* where the papyrus has *δος*, a reading which seems worthy of serious consideration. An examination of the formulae used in Homeric prayers⁴ shows the following results. In the *Odyssey* the imperative (alone or followed by the optative) is used in the majority of cases. The optative alone occurs occasionally. There are no cases (apart from the traditional reading in the line under consideration) of the "infinitive for imperative." *Δός* is found in III, 60; VI, 327; and IX, 530. In the *Iliad* the imperative (often followed by the optative) is used in the great majority of cases. The optative is used alone in III, 300 f., and the "infinitive for imperative" is found in II, 413 and VII, 179. *Δός* occurs in III, 322; III, 351; V, 118; VI, 307; VI, 476 (*δότε*); VII, 203; X, 281; XVI, 524; XVII, 646; XXIV, 309.

355. The first letter visible, though partly gone, is undoubtedly a sigma. The reading is thus shown to have been *γενοιθ οσσα*, not *γενοιτο οσα*. In the next words in the line the papyrus contains both readings (*φρεσι σῆσι* and *φρεσιν ἦσι*) on which the mss. divide, *ν* being written, in what appears to be the same hand, directly above *ς* as a correction.

CLINTON W. KEYES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

ADDENDUM ON ITHACA.

Since publishing the paper on Ithaca, pp. 221-238 of this volume, I have had an unexpected opportunity for another short visit to Ithaca. On this occasion the day was clearer than before, and Ithaca could be distinguished from Kephallenia as soon as the ship reached the mouth of the Gulf of Patras. From that point the heights of Kephallenia could be seen above nearly all that part of Ithaca which is south of the conspicuous peak, and also above the central part, but not above the rest of the island; they are visible chiefly to the south of Ithaca. The simile of a line of poles at the base of a hill is therefore not very apposite; but the main argument is unaffected.

F. P. JOHNSON.

⁴ Collected by E. J. (Brother E. Anselm) Strittmatter, *Prayer in the Iliad and Odyssey*, C. W. XVIII (1925), pp. 83-87; 90-92.

REPORTS.

GLOTTA, XVIII (1929), 1-2.

Pp. 1-4. F. Eichler, Eine altboiotische Töpferinschrift. An aryballos said to have come from near Thebes, and acquired in 1896 by the Antikensammlung in Vienna (Inventory No. 1864), bears a hitherto unnoticed inscription, Φίθῃ μ' ἐποίχεσε. Phithē, an s-less Boeotian nominative in -η, is a short form of Phithadas, a known Boeotian potter; the name is akin to Attic Πείθων, but shows regressive assimilation of the aspiration. Writing, dialect forms, artistic style all point to Boeotia as place of origin of the vase; probable date, early sixth century B. C.

Pp. 4-8. G. N. Hatzidakis, Über das chronologische Verhältnis einiger Lautgesetze des Altgriechischen zu einander. The contrast of θρίξ θάσσων θράσσω θρύπτω with κισσός πάσσων κίσσα, where all have two original aspirates, the second one before a consonant, is explained on the basis that at the date when χγ and θγ became σσ and πγ became πτ, the dissimilation of aspirates had not yet taken place; the forms with θ- are therefore phonetically regular and those with non-aspirates κ and π are analogical. Probably also θ was no longer a pure aspirate stop. The variation between -σσ- in κισσός and -σ- in μέσος is due to the difference in the position of the accent.

Pp. 8-65. Walter Goldberger, Kraftausdrücke im Vulgärlatein. The first section of a study of words in new meanings, as fresh emphatic expressions for old commonplace terms. These new uses may become regular (as in testa 'head'); or may be only occasional or employed by individuals, in fashion for a time or in a limited area, though sometimes widespread but not gaining literary position. Terms so used may be divided into the following groups, of which only the first is here dealt with: parts of the body, and the bodily activities; nicknames, words of affection and of dislike, and corresponding verbs; ideas of the external world.

The following ideas are discussed in detail: Kopf (testa 'pot, skull', cuppa, cochlea, cucurbita 'gourd, stupid person', etc); Ohr (auricula, a diminutive); Mund (bucca 'cheek', etc.); Wange; Kehle, Rachen; Brust; Schulter, Rücken (spatula 'ladle, swine's shoulder-blade', etc.); Achselhöhle; Schenkel, Bein; Eingeweide, Bauch; Nates, anus; Penis; Cunnus; Meretrix.

Pp. 65-66. M. Leumann, Ἀσσο- für Ἀπισσο- auf thessalischen Inschriften. In Thessalian inscriptions, names of the type

**Ἀσταρχος* are numerous alongside *Ἀρίσταρχος*; the abbreviation of *ἀριστο-* was perhaps supported by some old names in (Ϝ)*αστυ-*.

Pp. 67-100. Erika Kretschmer, *Beiträge zur Wortgeographie der altgriechischen Dialekte*. The evidence on the geographical extension of words in ancient Greek is contained in inscriptions, mostly not older than the fourth century B. C.; in the works of the old lexicographers and scholiasts; and here and there in the literary texts. Concerning each word a series of questions must be asked: Is the word general Greek, coming from the primitive I. E.? Is it general Greek, or local Greek, from the language of the pre-I. E. population? Does it belong specifically to one of the three Greek strata? Did it first appear in a Greek dialect in historic times, and spread thence? Does its origin belong to the Koine? The following ideas are studied, the chief Greek words for each being here listed: Diener, Sklave: *δμῶς ἀμφίπολος θεράπων δοῦλος οἰκέτης ἀνδράποδον λεῷς ὑπηρέτης οἰκέυς φοικιάτας λάτρης θῆς σῶμα*. Priest: *ιερεὺς θεοκόλος λείτωρ φανοφόροι θύστας θύτης ῥέκτας βουμέτρης ἀχαιομάνταις πυρκόος ἀγῆτωρ κάβαρνοι ἐσσην εὐαγγελίς βρύκαι*. Bürge: *ἐγγυος ἐγγυητής βεβαιωτήρ ἄμποχος ἀντάτας προαποδότας ἀνάδοχος*. Zeuge: *ιδνίος μάρτυς ρίστωρ ἐπάκοος γνωστήρ*. Nussknacker: *καρνοκατάκτης μονκηροφαγόρ*. Helfen: *βοηθῆν βοηδρομεῖν ἠγγοδρομεῖν ἐπικουρέω ἀρήγω χραισμεῖν*.

Pp. 101-109. S. P. Cortsen, *Die lemnische Inschrift, ein Deutungsversuch*. The non-Greek inscription of Lemnos, found 1886 (B. C. H. 1886; Ath. Mit. 1908), is essentially Etruscan. The numerals 1-6 are *θυ zal ci śa maχ huθ*; *sialχveiz* means 40 (Steph. Byz. *Ὑττηνία* as earlier name of Attic Tetrapolis is rejected as evidence that *huθ* means 4); *maraz*: *mav* is for *maraz-(u)m av(iz)* 'and five years', *maraz* being connected with *maχ* '5'. Text A (the obverse) is thus to be read and interpreted:

<i>holaiez naφoθ ziazi</i> :	Holaiez, der Sohn des Ziaz,
<i>zivai</i>	gestorben,
<i>evisθo zeronaiθ</i>	in diesem Grab,
<i>sialχveiz</i> : <i>aviz</i>	im Alter von 45 Ja(hren).
<i>maraz</i> : <i>mav</i>	
<i>vanalasial</i> : <i>zeronai</i> : <i>morinail</i>	<i>Vanalasial</i> weihte das Grab,
<i>aker tavarzio</i>	<i>Morinail</i> das Gut als Totengabe.

The relatives, not liking A, which lacked some of the regular epitaphic items, added text B (the reverse): Der Phokäer *Holaiezi* in diesem Grabe; (als) Häuptling und Oberpriester gestorben; einen Zug fern von Phokäa unternehmend gestorben; 45 Jahre gelebt habend.

Pp. 110-111. P. Kretschmer, *Ὑττηνία*. A defense (against Cortsen) of Östir's view that Etr. *hut huθ* means 4, as shown

by the item in Steph. Byz.; the only positive piece of outside evidence for the value of an Etr. numeral must not be lightly cast aside. See preceding article.

Pp. 111. F. Adami, Zu P. Linde Homerische Selbsterläuterungen, Glotta 1924 S. 223. The etymological play on Odysseus' name is found also τ 405 ff., with the same motif as in ξ 144-147; where Eumaios will not utter Odysseus' name because he loves him, but the name is indicative of hate.

Pp. 112-131. Johann Sofer, Lateinisch-Romanisches aus den Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla. This third part (cf. Gl. XVI, 1-47, XVII, 1-46) lists the 'Romanisms' of Isidore, i. e., the words (forms or meanings) first appearing in Isidore or in his time and persisting in Romanic languages: botanical terms (ala 'inula', lorandrum 'rhododendrum', nixa, melimelum malomellus), zoological-anatomical (formicoleon, botrax, mustio, capitium, columna, pinnula, pirula), verbs (back-formations prostro stro; recomposed forms decadere, confrango, proiacto, resapio), adjectives (blavus, mesticius, sinixter; and the adverb ozie 'hodie'), miscellaneous (baselus, imbriculus, ostracus, smyris, t(h)ius).

Pp. 132-146. Edwin Müller-Graupa, Primitiae. 1. Biene, Imme, *apis*, ἐμπίς: these words are not to be taken with Prellwitz, Gl. XV, 153, as from a root meaning to drink, but the words meaning 'bee' refer to the droning, the stinging, and the building activities. 2. *titus*, *gaius*, *lucius* as proper names are not (pace Niedermann) transfers of the common nouns meaning 'dove', 'jay', 'pike (fish)'; besides other objections, the transfer of names takes place from men to animals rather than vice versa.

Pp. 146-153. Albrecht v. Blumenthal, Messapisches. (6) Kaibel C. G. F. 198 ff. gives S. Ital.-Sicilian glosses, containing much 'barbarian' material, therefore probably some Messapian; Nos. 151-155 are designated as such. One of these, βύριον· οἶκημα, has an unfamiliar suffix which enables us to identify Kaibel No. 95 γολύριον· κέλνφος, a Tarentine word, as Messapian, corrected to φελύριον by Kaibel; cognate to Latin volvo. The Greek καλύβη, grouped by Boisacq with καλύπτω and κέλνφος, is shown by its β to be of Illyric origin. (7) Kretschmer, Gl. XII, 278 ff., showed the identity of Sicil. Λάχεσις, Mess. Logetis, Greek Λάχεσις as the name of a goddess. A similar formation, Βαιῶτις, is given by Hesych. as an epithet of Aphrodite at Syracuse. Νῆστις, as fourth deity after Zeus, Hera, Aidoneus in the Empedoclean fragment, cannot be more than an epithet of Demeter, 'the fasting one', since it stands alongside three regular names. (8) The Tarentine festival Γραιρία (γραιβία ἡ γραιτία in Hesych.), evidently in honor of the Graiae, has an

intervocalic *f* which does not belong to Tarentine Greek. A genitive *graiuaihi* on a Messapian gravestone from Gnathia shows a personal name **graiwas*. The Graiae may therefore be considered to be native in Messapian territory. (9) Hesych. *κομάκτωρ*, quoted from the *Medea* of the Tarentine Rhinthon, and glossed by coactor C. G. L. II, 102, 23 (also other glosses; and Inscr. Magn. 217 Kern), is not taken from Latin, which always has coactor, but is Oscan **kom-ahtōr* remade in Messapian after Greek *ἄκτωρ*. Rhinthon's *καλτίον* (Pollux VII, 90) is obviously equal to Latin *calceus* in meaning, but probably from an Oscan word with a different suffix; Greek may play a part here also. (10) Mess. *πανός* 'bread' (Ath. III, 111c), with two derivatives, is an original Messapian word, not taken from Latin *panis*, for Oscan territory separated Latin from Messapian, and Oscan said *caria* 'bread' (Placid. 25, 19 D.). (11) The Greek use of *αὐτοῦ* and its forms, replacing *ἐαυτοῦ αὐτοῦ* and their forms as reflexive pronoun, spread from the west; it is likely that the usage came from Illyrian or Messapian. Cf. also Sommer, I. F., XLII, 128, who interprets *sselboisselboi* on the ewer of Canevói as Venetic, = 'sibi ipsi' (cf. O. H. G. *der selb selbo*), like the peculiar late Greek *αὐτοσαντόν*.

Pp. 153-154. Albrecht v. Blumenthal, *Illyrische Rückstände im Dorischen*. Illyric remnants are seen in Laconian *βερνώμεθα*: *κληρωσώμεθα* (Hesych.), denominative to the Illyric cognate of *φερνή* 'dower'; and in *δύτα* 'aedicula' (Troezen, I. G. IV, 823, 41; Thebes, I. G. VII, 2477), akin to *θύω*, Latin *fumus*. (Incidentally, *ζωρναί* in the Troezen inscr. is a development of *διωρναγá* 'ditch'.)

Pp. 155-158. S. P. Cortsen, *Zum Etruskischen*. The stems *hup-* and *tus-*, of which the occurrences are given, have the same meaning, 'couch, bed'; *hupni* 'ossuarium'; *tusurthir* 'consors tori, Ehegatte.' Personal names from these stems are no more remarkable than German *Kirchhof*.

Pp. 158-160. Alfred Klotz, *Carnis* nom.? Priscian G. L. II, 208, 18, quotes *carnis* as nominative from Livius Andronicus and from Livy XXXVII, 3, 4; but in both passages *carnis* is a partitive genitive; parallels are cited, notably Enn. Ann. 235 V.²

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILOLOGUS, LXXXIII (N. F. XXXVII) 1928.

Pp. 1-17. O. Hey, 'AMAPTIA. An attempt to ascertain the meaning of the word as used by Aristotle in the Poetics. An examination is made of the various meanings of the word in the literature from Homer's time. The article is continued on a later page.

Pp. 18-30. Karl Praechter, Platon Präformist? On the strength of a passage in Michael of Ephesus, Plato has been counted as a believer in preformation. No hint of this belief is found in Plato's works, nor does Aristotle mention Plato in his discussion of the subject. Michael was a strong admirer of Aristotle, but knew Plato chiefly at second hand, hence the mistake of attributing to Plato a theory which was not his.

Pp. 31-54. Th. Birt, Marginalien zu lateinischen Prosaikern. A series of disconnected observations on various Latin authors, dealing with textual criticism, interpretation, and similar matters. The article is continued on a later page.

Pp. 55-88. Thomas Otto Achelis, Die hundert äsopischen Fabeln des Rinucci da Castiglione. This industrious translator made a version of Aesop which is important because it occupies a place midway between the early versions and the later ones. The present article is an elaborate investigation of the translation, which appeared in 1448. The point is made that although Rinucci's translation was of great value in transmitting Greek culture to Europe, nevertheless it often departs from the original Greek.

Pp. 89-105. C. Mengis, Fragmente einer Freiburger Prudentiushandschrift. Among the manuscript fragments of the State Archives at Freiburg are four parchment leaves which were part of a Prudentius manuscript. The present article is a careful examination of this manuscript. The text is given, and conclusions are reached with respect to the original size of the manuscript.

Pp. 106-112. Miscellen. 1. pp. 106-112. Otto Schroeder, *Astrophia bei Euripides und Aristophanes in neuer Beleuchtung*. This article is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the first stasimon of Euripides' *Ion*, the second with lines 209-68 of Aristophanes' *Frogs*. The author's purpose is to cast new light on the theory of inner responsions in the chorus passages of the drama. After an elaborate analysis of the passages it is pointed out that in the chorus of the *Ion* division may be made into two pairs of similar groups, each of 72 and 114 beats, $a^1 a^2 : a^1 a^2$; while in the chorus from the *Frogs* there is no necessity for unequal division, since the chorus arranges itself in the pattern of IV : IV XII : XII metres.

Pp. 113-136. S. Luria, Ein milesischer Männerbund im Lichte ethnologischer Parallelen. This is a contribution on a Milesian inscription which deals with a guild of singers. This guild was recruited from the aristocracy, and hence did not include all of the citizens. It may be assumed that at first the clubs were opposed to the Neleid kings, and that the greatest triumph for Milesian aristocracy came when the king was obliged to take part in the ritual of the clubs. These guilds were comparable to the clubs and age-classes that existed in Sparta. Comparison is made between these Greek clubs and the Roman Salii, and material is drawn from various anthropologists showing the existence of similar organizations in many parts of the world. These clubs exercised great political influence wherever they existed. It appears in the light of other evidence that this Milesian club is not a development of the late oligarchical period, but on the contrary, goes back to a very primitive age, possibly as far back as the pre-Hellenic period.

Pp. 137-163. O. Hey, 'AMAPTIA. Conclusion of the preceding article, pp. 1-17. It is shown that in the authors before Aristotle the word had a variety of meanings. In the writings of Aristotle, however, the words ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμαρτήμα and ἀμαρτία belong not to the moral sphere but to the intellectual. It is difficult to find a single word to translate ἀμαρτία, the translation must depend on the character of the person to whom the fault is attributed. The fault of Oedipus consists in this. A dreadful fate had been prophesied for him. If he had wished to avoid that fate he should have avoided killing any man and marrying any woman. Instead, he killed an old man who could be his father and married a woman who could be his mother. What he did was the result of foolishness, not of sin. If this interpretation is correct, the moral and ethical implications which some critics have assigned to the tragedy must be discarded.

Pp. 164-182. Th. Birt, Marginalien zu lateinischen Prosakern. Conclusion of the preceding article, pp. 31-54. Observations on authors ranging from Pliny to the Christian apologists, designed to correct or to illustrate the text.

Pp. 183-192. Otto Immisch, Der Hain der Anna Perenna. The difficult passage in Martial IV, 64 may be explained by emending the text to read *et, quod Virgine[o] cru(di)ore gaudet* instead of *et, quod virgineo cruore gaudet*.

Pp. 193-203. Paul Lehmann, Reste und Spuren antiker Gelehrsamkeit in mittelalterlichen Texten. There is but slight probability that more classical manuscripts will be discovered, it therefore behooves scholars to search mediaeval manuscripts to find traces of classical learning. The present article gives

an account of the classical learning found in the glosses to an Orosius manuscript of the ninth century.

Pp. 204-224. Miscellen. 2. pp. 204-207. Erich Ziebarth, Hypothekinschrift aus Dystos. An inscription from Dystos in Euboea casts light on the development of property regulations in the Greek islands during the Hellenistic period. 3. pp. 207-212. Oskar Viedebant, Metrologica II. Observations on the equivalents of the Attic medimnus. 4. pp. 212-218. N. Wecklein (†), Zu Homer. Sundry corrections in the text. 5. pp. 218-220. Franz Zimmermann, Ein korrupter Medizinerausdruck bei Chariton. In the doubtful passage I 8, 1, ἀφέσεως is to be read for αἰφέσεως. 6. pp. 220-224. Albrecht von Blumenthal, Der Apollontempel des Trophonios und Agamedes in Delphi. The source of Pausanias' description of this temple is Pindar's eleventh Paean. The first temple at Delphi belongs to the earliest period of Greek architecture known to us. After a technical discussion of the architecture based on the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, these conclusions are reached. 1. The technical term οὐδός in the Iliad and in the Hymn shows that the temple which was burned in 548 was older than the Iliad. 2. Like the Heraeum in Olympia it was built of clay bricks with stone pillars.

Pp. 225-258. Hans Erich Stier, ΝΟΜΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. The old theory that the change from Periclean democracy to Hellenistic monarchy was a sign of decadence is no longer satisfactory; there must have been some sort of inner development at work in Greece which brought about the change. The whole process of change is too complex to be summed up in a simple formula. The present article, in attempting to solve the problem, seeks to make clear the development of the νόμος idea. The first appearance of the word is in Hesiod, although the νόμος idea as a ruling principle of statecraft reaches its height only at the end of the fifth century. The use of νόμος in the literature is critically examined, and the changes in the meaning of the word are set forth. These changes of the public mind with respect to νόμος reflect the changes in political theory and practice, so that as νόμος came to mean law rather than custom, the Greeks came to accept a monarch who embodied the law in his own person.

Pp. 259-305. Julius Röhr, Beiträge zur antiken Astro-meteorologie. The article is divided into five parts, 1. the moon and the atmosphere, 2. the planets and the atmosphere, 3. the zodiac and the atmosphere, 4. the combination of the zodiac and the planets in their influence on the atmosphere, and 5. the fixed stars and the atmosphere. In each part illustrative passages from the ancient writers are adduced, and the article is documented with 296 footnotes.

Pp. 306-315. J. Morr, Poseidonios—eine Quelle Strabons im XVII. Buche. An examination of Strabo's seventeenth book shows several passages which can be traced to Poseidonios. Strabo's principal source was, however, Artemidorus of Ephesus.

Pp. 316-330. Fritz Walter, Zu lateinischen Schriftstellern. Observations on sundry Latin writers, chiefly with a view to improving the text.

Pp. 331-336. Miscellen. 7. pp. 331-335. Edward Brandt, Zum Aeneis-Prooemium. The verses beginning *Ille ego* which are sometimes prefixed to the Aeneid, are not Vergil's. They were probably composed in the first century for a publisher. 8. pp. 335-336. C. Fries, Adnotatiunculæ criticae Tullianæ. Attempts to mend two passages.

Pp. 337-344. C. Ritter, Was bedeutet ἀναβάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ λευθέρως bei Platon, Theait. 175 e? Several scholars, among them Schleiermacher, Apelt and Wilamowitz suppose that ἀναβάλλεσθαι refers to the proper draping of the garment over the right arm. If this passage is compared with others in Plato, such an interpretation is seen to be impossible. The other meaning of the verb 'to strike up an air on the lyre' is to be preferred.

Pp. 345-389. Willy Morel, Iologica. The countries in which the ancients lived are full of all kinds of serpents, many of which are venomous. For this reason the serpent played an important rôle in the mythology, art, religion, and science of the ancient people. The important sources for the present article are the Theriaka of Nikander of Colophon, the lost translation of this by Aemilius Macer, and the work of the physician Philumenos. In the ninth book of his Pharsalia, Lucan tells how some of Cato's soldiers died of snake bite in their march through the Libyan desert. Lucan's source here was Aemilius Macer, as is abundantly shown by the evidence. The article contains much curious information about serpents, drawn from the ancient writers.

Pp. 390-399. Alfred Klotz, Zu Caes. bell. Gall. VII 75. There are certain difficulties in this passage, in which are set down the numbers of the relief force sent to Alesia at the command of Vercingetorix. Corrections are offered in the text in order to make the numbers of the forces here agree with the figures given elsewhere.

Pp. 400-418. Rudolf Zimmermann, Die Autorschaft Tibulls an den Elegien 2-6 des IV. Buches. Elegies 2-6 of the fourth book comprise a unit in themselves. The present author gives a statistical summary of the vocabulary of the elegies in question in order to determine whether the poems are to be assigned to Tibullus. The vocabulary shows many instances of agree-

ment with the language of the genuine elegies, nevertheless the conclusion is reached that the author of the disputed elegies was not Tibullus, but another elegist who had set himself to imitate Tibullus as closely as possible.

Pp. 419-438. M. Boas, Spuren der ausservulgatischen Rezension in mittelalterlichen Catobearbeitungen. The Barb. Lat. 41 shows traces of a tradition older than the vulgate, but nevertheless this Ms. is not a middle point between the vulgate and Ms. Δ from which the vulgate is derived. The traces of the Barberinianus are found in a fairly limited area, in France, Germany, and The Netherlands. The origin of the Ms. cannot, however, be discovered. An elaborate discussion is given of the Barberinianus and its relation to the other parts of the text tradition.

Pp. 439-466. Miscellen. 9. pp. 439-443. Joh. Sykutris, Solon und Soloi. The connection of Solon with Soloi has been predicated upon two verses of an elegy addressed to Philokypros. These verses are shown to be interpolations which were inserted to explain the Solon legend, a legend which arose independently of the elegy in question. 10. pp. 443-448. Wilhelm Bannier, Zur lex Acilia repetundarum. An attempt to supply the parts of the text missing in the inscription, and to define the duties of the praetor as mentioned therein. It is pointed out that a case coming under the provisions of this law was to be conducted by the praetor urbanus or by the praetor peregrinus, and that a special magistrate was not appointed for such cases. 11. pp. 448-450. Wilhelm Port, Zum Aufbau der ersten Ode des Horaz. The ode is to be thought of as being composed in distichs and groups of distichs. 12. pp. 450-453. Karl Münscher, Katalepton IX 15. In line 15 we should read *Argium* instead of *Pylum*. The reference would then be to Adrastus. 13. pp. 453-458. Josef Mesk, Der Schiedsspruch in der siebenten Ekloge Vergils. It is neither from ethical nor aesthetic motives that Vergil lets Corydon defeat Thyrsis in the singing match. The offerings of the two contestants are equal, therefore the contest could end, according to the principle of *variatio*, either with a tie or with the discomfiture of one contestant. Vergil chose to follow his model Theocritus by awarding the prize to Corydon. 14. pp. 459-466. Friedr. Levy, Der Weltuntergang in Senecas naturales quaestiones. In describing the end of the world, Seneca saw it with the eye of the dramatist, and described it as a tragic poet would. He wanted to offer a dramatic description in opposition to Ovid's account of the flood which was in the epic vein. Seneca therefore carefully composes his account in a series of dramatic climaxes. At the end he turns to a criticism of Ovid because he believed that his own dramatic account of the catastrophe was better than Ovid's epic story.

HARRISON C. COFFIN.

REVIEWS

De Ablativo Absoluto Quaestiones; by Edwin Flinck-Linkomies, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*. Ser. B. Tom. xx, No. 1, Helsingforsiae, 1929. Pp. 272.

This rather elaborate study begins with a survey of the treatment of the ablative absolute category from the earliest times. To Priscian is ascribed the first recorded reference to the construction; and while that grammarian assigns to it no special name, it is interesting to note that he affirms two types, illustrated by *Traiano bellante* and *rege Latino*.

Not until the twelfth century is this use cited as "absolute," and then apparently on the ground that the ablative is not "governed" (*regi*) by anything, the conception being rather strictly grammatical.

At about the beginning of the last century the inevitable search for an "origin" for the ablative absolute was initiated; and the work now under discussion stands as the latest exponent of that time-honored tradition.

Flinck, however, does not hold for an Indo-European origin. As a matter of fact, in the Indo-European group of languages each one of the cases is found in absolute use, and the question of a common "source" for this motley array might well stagger the most enthusiastic and inveterate seeker of origins.

Assuming the ablative absolute construction to be indigenous to Italy, Flinck raises the question whether it is an inheritance shared with other Italic dialects or whether it belongs to Latin alone. At this point a strong bias appears in the discussion, every effort being made to discredit possible examples cited for the other dialects; and, on this basis, it is concluded that the construction is to be recognized in Latin only.

The chapter next following (III) seems at first sight irrelevant, and it certainly is quite unconvincing, its aim being to demonstrate that, in the time of Plautus and Terence, the participles had little or no verbal force.

As the reading progresses, it appears that this attempt to distort the facts is intended to clear the way for the author's theory that the origin of the ablative construction is "sociative." To support this thesis, he wishes to begin with phrases made up of nouns and adjectives; for expressions with verbal force would not lend themselves so easily to the theory which he would establish. In what a misleading fashion the material for Plautus and Terence is handled appears at once when a comparison is

made with the muster for Early Latin provided by Bennett in the *Syntax of Early Latin*, II, 368 ff.

It is interesting—and very human—that while Flinck at the outset (p. 28) warns against a priori theorizing (“non legibus ante constitutis ad sermonis naturam investigandam accedendum”), he should himself here be firmly wedded to a preconceived idea to which everything is made to bend. Everywhere recalcitrant material is forced into the “sociative” column, e. g. Plautus, *Bacch.* 419: Neque equidem illum *me vivo* conrumpi sinam. On this Flinck says (p. 54): “societas ablativo exprimitur, tamquam si dictum esset ‘illum, dum me vivum habebit, conrumpi non sinam.’”

Probably few would think that such argument establishes *me vivo* as a sociative expression in the above context; and indeed, after a similar bit of exegesis, Flinck himself remarks (p. 60): “quamquam concedo huiusmodi interpretationem magis esse artificiosam quam quae probanda sit.” Yet he continues this same practice with the greatest freedom in the chapters that follow.

His attitude of mind is indicated in another way by a remark (p. 119) to the effect that we should not “despair” of bringing certain unpromising material into line with a sociative origin (neque vero desperandum est nos rationem quae inter hos qui videntur temporales et illos sociativos ablativos intercedat indagare posse”). Such prejudiced treatment may well leave the reader with the feeling that perhaps the same materials could be handled in such a way as to support a rival theory.

To go a step further, Flinck’s selection of an “origin” for the ablative absolute construction raises another important question, namely: What justification is there for seeking a source for the ablative absolute in some one specific subdivision of normal ablative usage? Flinck himself (p. 8) expresses little confidence in the grammatical acumen of scholars of the Middle Ages; and Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* i. 4. 26) makes it clear that in his time teachers did not differentiate any too clearly the major uses of the ablative case. What then of the linguistic consciousness of the unreflective people of the time of Plautus?

For the period of Early Latin, can we in any sense properly assume ablative usage to have been divided up into neat little compartments labelled ‘accompaniment,’ ‘instrumentality,’ ‘quality,’ ‘manner,’ etc.? (Note the sharp distinction made between ‘sociative’ and ‘modal’ by Flinck on p. 53 fn.) Is it anything more than an academic exercise to go source-hunting among these refinements of grammarians of a later age?

In regard to this whole matter, it is interesting to note that Whitney recognizes in Sanskrit the absolute use of three cases,

the locative, the genitive, and the instrumental. Of the first of these he says (*Sanskrit Grammar*, 303. b): "On the other hand, the expression by the locative of a condition of things in which anything takes place, or of a conditioning or accompanying circumstance, passes over into a well-marked absolute construction, which is known even in the earliest stage of the language, but becomes more frequent later."

In the time of Plautus, the Romans normally acquired their speech-feeling from hearing their elders talk; and they were guided, in their use of the ablative, by instinctive impulses based on such tutelage. There would also be extensions, due to analogy, accident, idiosyncrasy, or other causes. In view of the wide application of the ablative case, irregularity and extension must have been specially easy.

When the grammarians later undertook to reduce all this to order, the establishment of major functions of ablative usage was easy enough. But there was material lying outside these bounds also; and Priscian, for example, recognizes this fact in calling attention to a special use of the ablative typified by such phrases as *Traiano bellante* and *rege Latino*. To try to determine to which of the major impulses (one or more) this particular existence of ablative usage is due is probably a vain quest; and, as a matter of fact, such considerations are of very little practical importance.

Far more to the point it would be, if possible, to determine just how much of the fringe of ablative usage is to be cut off and recognized as "absolute." What is an ablative absolute? Too often it seems to be taken for granted that the answer to this question is obvious, whereas more satisfactory progress would be made if a discussion were to begin with a definition.

It is only when p. 92 is reached that Flinck feels it necessary to explain what he understands to be covered by the use of the term "absolute" in this connection. Combining what he and others say, a tentative definition might run as follows:

"The Ablative Absolute is an ablative phrase, the logical relation of whose content to that of the main statement is not explicit in the choice of case."

This would mean that an ablative phrase is not recognized as "absolute," if its case can be justified by the fact that it conveys, for example, an instrumental meaning; e. g. Martial, v. 76. 1 ff.:

Profecit *poto* Mithridates saepe *veneno*
Toxica ne possent saeva nocere sibi.

In this ablative phrase the participle is used in somewhat the same way as the participle in Caesar occisus ("the murder of Caesar"), and the whole is quite as instrumental as would be

potando veneno, or *veneni potione*. This therefore is *not* an ablative absolute.

On the other hand, in Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* ii. 32. 1 it reads: *Dimisso consilio contionem advocat militum*. Here a time-after-which relation may be discerned; but that is explicit in the tense of the participle, and the case of the ablative phrase stands for none of the regular ablative relations. This therefore is an example of absolute use. The same may be said of such a turn as *magnis vulneribus acceptis pugnabat tamen*. That the case tells no story is shown by the fact that a phrase with a nominative participle would serve as well: *magnis vulneribus confectus pugnabat tamen*. With either phrasing the relation of the opening words is concessive, which, of course, is not an ablative function.

The above definition will distinguish clearly between sharply contrasted types of ablative phrases; but it by no means furnishes a practical general working rule. For no one who examines the facts without prejudice can fail to see that, in Roman linguistic consciousness, there was no fixed line of demarcation rigorously dividing ablative phrases according as they served or did not serve to mark some one of the standard ablative relations. In unreflective linguistic consciousness there must have been an extensive uncharted middle ground. And that mature reflection would not by any means have cleared up many points of doubt is abundantly indicated by the difference of opinion among scholars of the present day as to the interpretation of specific examples.

Incidentally, there is an added complication in the matter of phrases made up, for example, of nouns and pronouns (such as *me adiutrice* and *Crasso consule*). Are we justified in saying that *me consule* in certain connections is to be denied "absolute" status on the ground that it is a "time" expression of regular ablative scope? And is *te vate* to be regarded as having the force of *vaticinatione tua*? Or, on the other hand, is Priscian right in stating that with all such phrases we must supply the non-existent present participle of the verb *esse*? And would the predicate relation thus enforced in every case establish an "absolute" relation?

There seems little prospect of framing a rule in terms of grammar or logic that will sharply divide the "ablative absolute" from other uses of that case. Handicapped by a grammatical heritage, we find it hard to reach new points of view; but a survey of the abundant material collected by Flinck suggests that it might not be out of harmony with Roman linguistic feeling, if we should approach the data assembled for such an investigation as presenting a problem primarily stylistic. At

any rate, Flinck's lists show in a very striking way that many of the phrases naturally presented for consideration in a study of this sort tend to fall into distinctive groups, which perpetuate themselves from generation to generation, becoming more "phraseological" doubtless as time went on, and thus farther removed from analytic appraisal on the part of the users.

While it is true that Flinck's study rests upon an *a priori* assumption in support of which the data are marshalled and manipulated in a very misleading way, it is not to be inferred that his work lacks value. It is a thought-provoking study, wrought out with meticulous care, and it presents a unique collection of material running down into medieval times. Such a work no one interested in the subject can afford to pass by.

H. C. NUTTING.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, par Albert Severyns.
Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de
l'Université de Liège, Fascicule XL, Dissertation Inaugurale, 1828, pp. xvi + 454.

The author of this book has already achieved a reputation by his studies in the Cycle and Eustathius, and in this he definitely strives for a position along with Lehrs, Ludwich, and Roemer, whose work he accepts as the foundation for his own. He is nearest to Roemer in that he sees in the existing scholia only a possible means for divining the notions of Aristarch, not the notions themselves. The comments of Aristarchus have passed through so many hands and have been so often condensed or misunderstood that frequently the scholia give as the opinion of the great Alexandrian the very thing he denied.

When Aristarchus used the words *οἱ νεώτεροι* he always gave to them a definite meaning, a technical meaning, and he meant thereby the Greek poets from Hesiod to the poets of his own day. This technical meaning was soon forgotten, so that later transcribers felt it necessary to add the word *ποιηταί*, later the phrase *οἱ μεταγενέστεροι ποιηταί*, which left out the essential word, *νεώτεροι*, and finally all notion of the meaning was lost, so that the scholiast to Ω 228 remarks: "Aristarchus says that *κιβωτὸν λέξιν νεώτεραν εἶναι* but he does not know that it is used both by Simonides and Hecataeus." Here the very thing Aristarchus taught was made to confute his own teachings, since Simonides was to him one of the *νεώτεροι*, while to the scholiast he belonged with the *ἀρχαῖοι*. This one example gives some indication of the

great difficulty in reaching Aristarchus through those who did not understand him.

Bad as the situation is in general it is far worse in the matter of the Cycle, since when the scholia took final form the public had no interest in the Cyclic Poems, they were unread and forgotten, so that the scribe tried to make his work interesting by substituting for references to the Cycle names of better known writings or poets. The Geneva scholium to E 126 tells the story of the enraged Tydeus opening the skull of his slain enemy, Melanippus, and devouring the brains, explaining that this story is from the Cycle. Later scholia give the same story, but there it is referred to Pherecydes. By a series of cogent examples and parallels our author shows that originally this was assigned to the Cycle, then some learned scribe added, "found in Pherecydes also," but the scribe to give the final form to the scholium knew little and cared less for the Cycle, hence substituted the added Pherecydes whom he knew for the writers of the Cycle whom he did not know. By such methods all connection with the poems was severed.

By the help of Proclus, Eustathius, Apollodorus, Athenaeus, Strabo, Pausanias, and other writers, by scholia of many kinds, by means of grammatical and lexical references, and by the remains of ancient art our author tries to restore the scholia and then to recover the sources which they did not understand. He seeks in these scholia to track out the whole cyclic story from the Battles of the Titans to the story of Telegonus. The references are pitifully few and uncertain, since he finds that in all these scholia the Titanomachia is named just once, the Cypria but four times, the Sack of Troy but once, the Little Iliad thrice, the Nostoi twice, and the Telegonia but once, while not another one of the many assumed epics is ever named in all the mass of Homeric scholia. No one without great imagination and confidence in his own deductive powers could undertake this huge task of conjecture and divination.

One thing made very clear and with abundant proof is the great difference between the methods of Zenodotus and Aristarchus. Zenodotus interpreted Homer by means of the Cycle and tried to bring the Iliad and the Odyssey in harmony with these poems, while Aristarchus denied all connection between them, except imitation in the Cycle, and the very fact that something found in Homer has its explanation in the Cycle was to him sufficient reason for doubting the Homeric authorship of that passage. Many of the verses rejected by Aristarchus were rejected on the ground of their resembling something in the Cycle. It is the great merit of Aristarchus that he appreciated the vast difference between the spheres of Homeric and Cyclic

poetry, just as Aristotle had recognized their difference in structure.

A book which is based so largely on conjecture cannot all be true, even if it is extremely brilliant, and I am sure the author is mistaken in assuming that he has found a fragment of the Nostoi in the account of the death of Agamemnon contained in the eleventh book of the Odyssey. He assumes that there are two contradictory accounts of that death, the one in the earlier books as told to Telemachus, in which Clytemnestra has no part, and the one of book eleven in which she shares the guilt with Aegisthus. However, one verse in an earlier book is ignored, the one in which Nestor said: "Orestes slew the murderer of his father, Aegisthus, and gave a funeral feast to the Argives, a feast for his hated, *στρυφερῆς*, mother, and for the ignoble Aegisthus." The death of the mother and of Aegisthus must have come close together and the fact that she is "hated" has no explanation except in the assumption that she shared in the crime. Elsewhere Nestor directly charges her with sharing in the murder (Od. γ 235). It was perfectly natural that the shade of Agamemnon should feel keenest the brutal faithlessness of the wife. The great danger in a book like this is that a structure may be built too large for the few and doubtful facts that must furnish the foundation.

The author challenges comparison with Roemer and I like him, Severyns, better, since he writes in a simple and uninflated style and uses much supporting evidence that is overlooked by the other.

That such a book should be a Dissertation Inaugurale gives the hope of continued production, perhaps the revival of studies concerning those great and early critics who saw in the classical writers representatives of their own traditions and who used the very language that they themselves spoke.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Ad Atticum Epistularum Libri Sedecim (Fasc. II, Lib. V-VIII). Rec. H. Sjögren. Collectio Scriptorum Veterum Upsaliensis, Gothenburg, 1929, 6 kr. 50 öre.

This is a continuation of the editio major of the letters, the first fascicle of which appeared in 1916. The editio minor is to come out in the Teubner series where Sjögren's excellent edition of the ad familiares appeared in 1925. The chief value of this larger edition is its full apparatus criticus. Sjögren spent

several years making a new collation of all the important manuscripts before he wrote his remarkable *Commentationes Tullianae* in 1910. Now we are getting not only the ripe fruit of this collation, which at once displaces all others, but also a very intelligent gleaning from all the vast accumulation of former emendations. And there is no Latin text that stands more in need of such an apparatus than the collection of Atticus letters, for it still bristles with cruces, many of which can doubtless be disposed of now that we are getting a sound basis on which to work.

Sjögren's own text is very conservative. He has in fact been more liberal in admitting the conjectures of others than those that he has proposed from time to time. His own inclination is to defend the reading of the good manuscripts by offering parallels, by making easy transpositions or by a revision of the punctuation. In fact he has removed more cruces by such means than by emending. And his conjectures usually are simple and convincing, as for example *operae* (V. 2, 3), *belle* (V. 10, 3), *itaque* (V. 16, 3), *etiam* deleted (VII, 1, 8), XX for ex (VIII. 7, 1), and quo (VIII. 9, 1).

I have not noticed any errors in the book, nor many points of interpretation on which one could disagree. The reference to the Claudian inscription at VI. 1, 26 should have given the Corpus number of the 2nd edition. It is 775. Some of us prefer to keep the *lectio difficilior noenu* of M² at VII. 3, 10, simply because Nicias, who is apparently quoted here, was an editor of Lucilius, who used the archaic word. Finally Sjögren has done nothing to improve the traditional reading of VII. 7, 6, which keeps a meaningless *enim*. On p. 240 of this volume of the *A.J.P.* I have attempted to explain the Ms. reading of the passage.

Sjögren's recension is not only indispensable for Ciceronian studies but it is also a model of what recensions should be.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Hennig Brinkmann. *Zum Ursprung des liturgischen Spieles.*
Bonn: Verlag von Friedrich Cohen, 1929. Pp. 40. 1.80 M.

After summarizing the contributions to the subject of E. K. Chambers, Neil Brooks, Schwietering and, above all, of Karl Young, Brinkmann attempts to analyse for himself the motivating forces that brought the liturgical drama into being at a given time and in a particular place. Why, he asks, should the Easter

trope, *Quem quaeritis in sepulchro*,—and no other trope or ceremony—and why this very trope only after it had been transferred from Mass to Matins—have contained the quickened seed of the mediaeval drama? Because, he answers, the *Quem quaeritis* in its transition from the sad questioning of the Maries (*submissa voce*) to the jubilant *Surrexit* of the Angel (*alta voce*) exactly mirrored the transition from the mourning of Lent to the joy of Easter, and because in its new position—it was sung just after the doors of the church were thrown open to the laity and before the *Te Deum* commemorating the hour of the Resurrection—it served to give actuality to the culminating moment of the ecclesiastical year.

Except in minor details, Brinkmann builds upon the firm foundations laid down by his predecessors. He differs from Young in not regarding the reservation of a host on Holy Thursday for the Mass of Good Friday as among the formative antecedents of the Depositio and Elevatio, in positing Roman influence rather than a Roman origin for these ceremonies, and in showing that the original position of the Elevatio was not that later occupied by the Visitatio. He differs from Schwietering in not believing that the enkindling spark of the drama lay in "jenem unvergleichlichen Umschwung" from the sorrowing of Lent to the rejoicing of Easter. He overrates, however, his own expansion of this idea: it is only *after* the *Quem quaeritis* has become true drama that we find attached to it such directions as *humile*, *tremulae*, *submissa* and *alta voce*. The contemporary tendency to elaborate and make manifest by mimetic action the allegorical content of the church services and ceremonials, the dialogued structure of the Easter trope, its antiphonal presentation, its freedom to develop when detached from the Mass and transferred to Matins, its connection there with the nearly dramatic ceremonies of the Elevatio and Depositio, to which it served as climax, its chanting after the laity were admitted to the church before the singing of the commemorative *Te Deum*—all these factors contain within themselves, especially when combined, enough germs of dramatic life to explain the dramatic evolution of the Visitatio without unduly stressing the fact that the transition of tone within the trope itself reflected the spirit of the season.

On the whole, the value of Brinkmann's paper lies less in its original contributions to the subject, though these are not without interest, than in its convenient and generally sane interpretation of much scattered evidence.

GRACE FRANK.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

St. Andrews University Publications, XXIII. *Palaeographia Latina*. Part V. Edited by Prof. W. M. LINDSAY. Oxford University, New York, 1927. Pp. 78; nine plates. \$1.75.

Lindsay's serial continues to be of the utmost interest and value. This number contains six articles and nine excellent facsimiles. K. Löffler describes a group of ninth-century MSS from Weingarten in the Stuttgart Library and concludes with much probability that they were written in Constance, which thus becomes a "Rhaetian" center, beside Reichenau and St. Gall. Lindsay discusses some early MSS of Belgium and Holland, which show interesting "degeneration" of Irish traits; he pays his respects also again to the much overvalued medieval glossaries. Lowe calls attention to a leaf in the Corbie b-type, bound up in Paris. Lat. 4808. Dom DeBruyne has unearthed a new abbreviation, *het* = *haeret*, from an Anglo-Saxon fragment. Mlle. Dobiache-Rojdestwensky of the Leningrad Library has ascertained that the scribe of Petropol. F. V. I, 6 (Corbie) was named Ingreus. Rand contributes an astoundingly acute and painstaking study of the ruling and facing of the pages in Tours MSS—a new criterion of value for dating and other classification. It is a pity these valuable articles are so unworthily printed.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

Aeneae Silvii de Curialium Miseriis Epistola, edited with Introduction and Notes by WILFRED P. MUSTARD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. \$1.50.

MUSTARD continues his studies in the Renaissance Pastoral with this excellent little edition of a letter interesting as the model of the earliest English "eglogues"—Alexander Barclay's "Miseries of Courtiers"; in an appendix he prints several extracts which show close rendering of the Latin.

Aeneas Silvius, whose ancestral home still fronts on the picturesque square of Pienza (near Sienna), and who became Pope in 1458, was one of the best educated and most experienced statesmen of the fifteenth century. Out of the wealth of his observations as a high official in the German Empire, he produced this amusing sketch of the courtier's tribulations. Mustard's notes, which are a model of conciseness, point out his constant exploitation of Juvenal, Cicero, Horace and other classical and medieval writers, and explain such unusual words as *jocalia* (jewels) and *zinzalis* (mosquitos). The text pictures vividly

the life of that day, and its mishaps, as when (to quote Barclay's translation) :

The platters shall passe oft times to and fro
And ouer thy shoulders and head shall they go,
And oft all the broth and licour fat
Is spilt on thy gowne, thy bonet and thy hat.

The book is handy and well printed, and forms an admirable text for a class in late Latin.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

ERRATA.

P. 256, l. 189, delete the acute accent on the last letter of *ερητυσασκε*.

P. 258, l. 228, read *θ]εος*.

CLINTON W. KEYES.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aldick (Clara). *De Athenaei Dipnosophistarum epitomae codicibus Erbacensi Laurentiano Parisino. Monasterii Guestfalorum*, 1928. 72 pp. 8°.

Allardice (J. T.) *Syntax of Terence*. St. Andrews University Publications, No. XXVII. London, New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1929. 152 pp. 8°. \$1.25.

Athenaeus, the *Deipnosophists*. With an English Translation by C. B. Gulick. In Seven Volumes. Vol. III. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. viii + 510 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 224.)

Baynes (Norman H.) *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury*. London, *Cambridge University Press*, 1929. 184 pp. 8°. 10 s. 6 d.

Bunzel (Ruth L.) *The Pueblo Potter*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. 134 pp. \$10.00.

Catalogue of the Frances Taylor Pearsons Plimpton Collection of Italian Books and Manuscripts in the Library of Wellesley College. Compiled by Margaret Hastings Jackson. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1929. xxiii + 434 pp. 8°.

Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum libri sedecim. Recensuit H. Sjögren. Fasc. 2, libros V-VIII continens. (Collectio scriptorum veterum Upsaliensis.) Gotoburgi, *Eranos' Förlag*, 1929. 199 pp. 6 kr. 50 öre.

———. *The Letters to His Friends*. With an English translation by W. Glynn Williams. In three volumes. Vol. III. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 230.)

Concise (The) *Oxford Dictionary of Current English*. Adapted by H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler from the *Oxford Dictionary*. New edition revised by H. W. Fowler. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1929. viii + 1444 pp. 12°. \$3.50.

Couch (Herbert N.). *The Treasuries of the Greeks and Romans. Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Co., 1929. 112 pp. 8°. Cloth \$2.50; paper \$1.50.*

Crusius (Friedrich). *Die Responsion in den Plautinischen Cantica. (Philologus, Supplementband XXI, Heft 1.) Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929. 143 pp. 8°. Geheftet M. 10.50, gebunden M. 12.50.*

Cuendet (Georges). *L'ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles. Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, XXVI. Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1929. xvi + 170 pp.*

Densmore (Frances). *Papago Music. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 90. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1929. xx + 229 pp. 8°. \$1.25.*

Feldmann (Alfred). *Zum Aufbau der Geschichtserzählung bei Polybios. Bern, Buchdruckerei und Verlag E. Flück & Cie., 1929. 92 pp. 8°.*

Fiske (George C.) and Mary A. Grant. *Cicero's De Oratore and Horace's Ars Poetica. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 27.) Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1929. 152 pp. 8°.*

Fitzhugh (Thomas). *Letters of George Long. University, Va., The Library, University of Virginia, 1917. 66 pp. 8°.*

Garrod (H. W.). *The Profession of Poetry and other lectures. New York, Oxford University Press, 1929. x + 270 pp. 8°. \$4.50.*

Goodenough (Erwin R.). *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt. Legal administration by the Jews under the early Roman Empire as described by Philo Judaeus. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1929. vii + 268 pp. 8°. \$3.00.*

Greek-English (A) Lexicon. Compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. *A New Edition. Revised and Augmented throughout by H. S. Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Part 4: ἑξενονέω-θσαυριστικός. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1929. \$3.50.*

Griscom (Acton). *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1929. xii + 672 pp. 8°. \$10.00.*

Hazlitt (William). *Lectures on the English Poets. With notes by F. W. Baxter. London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1929. xii + 330 pp. 18mo.*

Helm (Rudolf). *Philologus, Supplementband XXI, Heft II. Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929. 98 pp. 8°. Geheftet M. 7.50, gebunden M. 9.00.*

Herbillon (Jules). *Les Cultes de Patras avec une Prosopographie Patréenne. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929. xvi + 183 pp. 8°.*

Hespéris, Vol. VIII, 1928. *Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études marocaines. Paris, Librairie Larose, 1928. 262 pp. 8°.*

Heuser (Gustav). *Die Personennamen der Kopten. Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde, Band I, Schrift 2. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929. xv + 125 pp. 8°. Geheftet M. 13.50.*

Hjelmlev (Louis). *Principes de Grammaire générale. København, Andr. Fred. Høst & Søn, 1928. 363 pp. 8°. (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XVI, I.)*

Homburger (L.) Noms des parties du corps dans les langues négro-africaines. Collection linguistique publiée par la Société des Linguistiques de Paris, XXV. Paris, *Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion*, 1929. 116 pp.

Honour Classics in the University of Toronto. By a group of classical graduates. With a foreword by Sir Robert Falconer, President of the University. Toronto, *University of Toronto Press*, 1929. 83 pp.

Isocrates. With an English translation by George Norlin, in three volumes, Vol. II. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. 541 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 229.)

Klibansky (Raymond). Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung. (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. 1928/29. 5. Abhandlung.) Heidelberg, *Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1929. 41 pp. 8°. Geheftet 2.40.

Körte (Alfred). Hellenistic Poetry. Translated by Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. xviii + 446 pp. 8°. \$4.00.

Kurrelmeyer (Wilhelm). Wielands gesammelte Schriften. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1928. 460 + 210 A pp. 8°.

Laistner (M. L. W.). A Survey of Ancient History to the Death of Constantine. New York, *D. C. Heath and Company*, 1929. xiii + 613 pp. 8°. \$3.80.

Lundström (Vilh.). Undersökningar i Roms Topografi. Göteborg, *Eranos' Förlag*, 1929. 137 pp. 8°. (Svenskt Arkiv för humanistiska Avhandlingar, II.)

Morley (Edith J.). Crabb Robinson in Germany, 1800-1805. Extracts from his Correspondence. London, *Oxford University Press*, 1929. 194 pp. 8°. \$3.50.

Osten (H. H. von der). The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor 1927-28. Chicago, Ill., *The University of Chicago Press*, 1929. 153 pp. 8°.

Patrick (Mary Mills). The Greek Sceptics. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. xxi + 339 pp. 8°. \$4.50.

Philo. With an English Translation by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. In Ten Volumes. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. Vol. I, xxxiv + 484 pp. Vol. II, 504 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, Nos. 226, 227.)

Philological Quarterly, Volume VIII, Nos. 3 and 4. Iowa City, Iowa, *University of Iowa*, 1929.

Plato, The Apology of Socrates. Edited by E. H. Blakeney. With Greek Text, Translation, Introduction, Appendices, and Comprehensive Commentary. London, *The Scholartis Press*, 1929. x + 203 pp. 8°. 30 s. net.

Plessow (Gustav). Des Haushälters Erzählung aus den Canterbury Geschichten Gottfried Chaucers. Berlin, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.*, 1929. ix + 169 pp. 8°.

Prümm (Carolus). Quaestionum Tullianarum ad dialogi de Oratore partes philosophicas spectantium specimen. Ad Saravi Pontem, *Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag A.-G.*, 1927. 67 pp. 8°.

Prümm (K.). Das Prophetenamt der Sibyllen in kirchlicher Literatur mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Deutung der 4. Ekloge Virgils. (Reprints from *Scholastik*, Vol. IV, pp. 53-77, 221-246, 498-533.) Freiburg i. Breisgau, *Herder & Co.*, 1929.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias, Vol. XXXIX, Enero-Junio 1929, Núms. 1 y 2. Havana, Cuba, *Universidad de la Habana*, 1929. 117 pp. 8°.

Rosenblatt (Samuel). The High Ways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides. Columbia University Oriental Studies, Vol. XXVII. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1927. 213 pp. 8°. \$3.50.

Rouse (W. H. D.). Machines or Mind? An introduction to the Loeb Classical Library. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*.

S. P. E. Tract No. XXXII. The B. B. C.'s recommendations for pronouncing doubtful words. Reissued with criticisms. Edited by Robert Bridges. London, New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1929. 8°. 32 + 373-411 pp. \$1.25.

Saurat (Denis). Blake and Modern Thought. New York, *Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press*, 1929. xv + 200 pp. 8°.

Schütte (Gudmund). Our Forefathers. The Gothonic Nations. A Manual of the Ethnography of the Gothic, German, Dutch, Anglo-Saxon, Frisian and Scandinavian Peoples. Vol. I. Translated by Jean Young. London, *Cambridge University Press, The Macmillan Co., Agents*, 1929. xi + 288 pp. 8°.

Schultz-Lorentzen. Dictionary of the West Greenland Eskimo Language. Copenhagen, *C. A. Reitzel*, 1927. xi + 303 pp. 8°. \$10.00.

Schwahn (Walther). Demosthenes Gegen Aphobos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Wirtschaft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1929, 46 pp. 8°. Geheftet M. 3.

Severyns (Albert). Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque. Paris, *Edouard Champion*, 1928. xvi + 454 pp. 8°. Belga 15. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Fascicule XI.)

Shewan (Alexander). Andrew Lang's Work for Homer. Being the Andrew Lang Lecture delivered before the University of St. Andrews, 15 November 1928. London, *Oxford University Press*, 1929. 30 pp. 8°. \$70.

Stebbins (Eunice B.). The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome. Menasha, Wisconsin, *The George Banta Publishing Co.*, 1929. 135 pp. 8°. Cloth, \$2.50, paper, \$1.50.

Strabo, The Geography of. Vol. VI. Translated by H. L. Jones. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. 385 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 223.)

Swanton (John R.). Myths and Tales of the Southeastern Indians. Smithsonian Institute, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 88. Washington, D. C., *Government Printing Office*, 1929. x + 275 pp. 8°. \$1.00.

Theophrastus Characters, Herodes, Cercidas, Choliambic Poets. (Except Callimachus and Babrius.) Translated by J. M. Edmonds and A. D. Knox. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. vii + 365 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 225.)

Thorndike (Lynn). Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century. Studies in the History of Medicine and Surgery, Natural and Mathematical Science, Philosophy and Politics. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. xii + 387 pp. 8°. \$4.75.

Warsher (Tatiana). Pompeii. Rome, *Industria Tipografica Imperia*, 1930. vii + 154 pp.

Wedek (Harry E.). Humour in Varro and other Essays. Oxford, England, *Basil Blackwell*, 1929, 112 pp. 6 s. net.

INDEX TO VOLUME L.

- Accentual Clausula, An Early
 Use of the, 374-377
 Addendum on Ithaca, 389
 Additions to "The First Idyl
 of Moschus in Imitations
 to the Year 1800," 190-193
Agricola of Tacitus, Notes on
 the, 266-272
 Alexander, Bucephalas Meets,
 193-195
 Andelys (Les), The Name of, 372
 ANDERSON, ANDREW RUNN.
 Bucephalas Meets Alex-
 ander, 193-195
 -Ario-, The Semantics of the
 Termination, 40-63
 Aristander, The Seer 195-197
 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 16. 1417b
 16-20, 170-180
 Books Received, 409-412
 BROUGHTON, T. R. S. The In-
 scription of Phileros, 279-285
 Bucephalas Meets Alexander,
 193-195
 Celtic (Early), Three Ety-
 mologies in, 370-372
Cena Rustica, Lucilius's 64-70
 "Chimney-Flue," Lithuanian
 Damlākas, Dumlākas, 168-169
 ΧΘΑΜΑΑΗ ΙΘΑΚΗ, 221-238
 Addendum on, 389
 Cicero's Letters, Notes on, 181-184
 Three Obscure Passages in,
 239-241
 "City of God," St. Augus-
 tine's, 109-137
 CLARK, CHARLES UPSON. An
 Early Use of the Accen-
 tual Clausula, 374-377
 Reviews:
 Lindsay's *Palaeographia La-*
 tina, 408
 Mustard's *Aeneae Silvii* . . .
 epistola, 408-409
 Clausula (Accentual), An
 Early Use of the, 374-377
 COFFIN, HARRISON C. Report
 of Philologus, 394-398
 Review of Christopher's S.
 Aurelii Augustini de cate-
 chizandis rudibus, 105-106
 Columbia University Papyrus
 Fragments,
 255-265, 386-389, 409
 Compounds (Substantive), On
 the Declension of, in Li-
 thuanian, 156-167
 COOPER, LANE. Aristotle,
 Rhetoric 3. 16. 1417b,
 16-20, 170-180
 Review of Roberts' Greek
 Rhetoric and Literary
 Criticism, 100-102
 Cratesipolis, The Political Ac-
 tivities and the Name of,
 273-278
 Damlākas (Lithuanian), Dum-
 lākas, "Chimney-Flue,"
 168-169
 Date (The) of the Octavius,
 185-189
 Declension, On the, of Sub-
 stantive Compounds in
 Lithuanian, 156-167
 DEFERRARI (ROY J.) and
 KEELER (M. JEROME). St.
 Augustine's "City of
 God," 109-137
 DENNIS, HOLMES V. M. 3d.
 The Date of the Octavius,
 185-189
 Dobson, Austin, Horace and
 the Poetry of, 1-20
 Dravidian Researches, 138-155
 DREW, D. L. The Structure
 of Vergil's *Georgics*, 242-254
 Dumlākas, *see* Damlākas,
 Early (An) Use of the Ac-
 centual Clausula, 374-377
 EBELING, HERMAN L. Report
 of Hermes, 286-295
 Errata, 409
 Etymologies (Three) in Early
 Celtic, 370-372
exacum, Gaulish, 370
 "First (The) Idyl of Moschus
 in Imitations to the Year
 1800," Additions to 190-193
 FRANK, GRACE. Review of
 Brinkmann's *Zum Ur-*
 sprung des liturgischen
 Spieles, 406-407
 FRANK, TENNEY. Notes on
 Cicero's Letters, 181-184
 Three Obscure Passages in
 Cicero's Letters, 239-241
 Reviews:
 Sjögren's *M. Tulli Ciceronis*

- ad Atticum epistularum
libri sedecim, 405-406
- Williams' Cicero, The Letters to His Friends, 104-105
- FUCILLA, JOSEPH G. Additions to "The First Idyl of Moschus in Imitations to the Year 1800," 190-193
- Gaulish *exacum*, 370
- Georgics, Vergil's, The Structure of, 242-254
- GRAY, LOUIS H. Three Etymologies in Early Celtic, 370-372
- HADAS, MOSES. Oriental Elements in Petronius, 378-385
- HALL, CLAYTON M. Report of Mnemosyne, 200-204
- Hesiod's Polyp, 76-78
- HETTICH, ERNEST L. Review of The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. VII, 304-309
- HIGHBARGER, E. L. Literary Imitation in the Theognidea, 341-359
- Hofmann's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Notes on, 319-340
- Homer, Plural Verbs with Neuter Plural Subjects in, 71-78
- Two Papyrus Fragments of, 386-389
- HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN. Review of Keith's, A History of Sanskrit Literature, 208-211
- Horace and the Poetry of Austin Dobson, 1-20
- Imitation, Literary, in the Theognidea, 341-359
- Inscription (The) of Phileros, 279-285
- Isle of Man, The Name of the, 371
- JOHNSON, F. P. XΘAMAAH IOAKH, 221-238
- Addendum on, 389
- KEELER (M. JEROME) and DEFERRARI (ROY J.). St. Augustine's "City of God," 109-137
- KENT, ROLAND G. Report of Glotta, 86-89; 295-296; 390-393
- Review of Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache, 215-216
- KEYES, CLINTON W. Papyrus Fragments of Extant Greek Literature, 255-265, 409
- Two Papyrus Fragments of Homer, 386-389
- Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Hofmann's, Notes on, 319-340
- LEASE, EMORY B. Notes on Hofmann's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, 319-340
- LIPSCOMB, HERBERT C. Horace and the Poetry of Austin Dobson, 1-20
- Literary Imitation in the Theognidea, 341-359
- Lithuanian *Damlākas*, *Dum-lākas*, "Chimney-Flue," 168-169
- Lithuanian, On the Declension of Substantive Compounds in, 156-167
- LODGE, GONZALEZ. Reviews: Elmer's Latin Grammar, 90-95
- Löfstedt's Syntactica, 211-213
- Lucilius's *Cena Rustica*, 64-70
- m, A Pre-Indo-European Change of *y* to, after *u* or *ə*, 360-369
- MACURDY, GRACE H. The Political Activities and the Name of Cratesipolis, 273-278
- Man, Isle of, The Name of the, 371
- MIEROW, HERBERT EDWARD. Hesiod's Polyp, 76-78
- "Moschus, The First Idyl of, in Imitations to the Year 1800," Additions to, 190-193
- MUSTARD, W. P. Report of Rivista di Filologia, 198-200
- Reviews: Amatucci's Storia della Letteratura latina cristiana, 214
- Duff's Lucan, 213-214
- Greenwood's Cicero, The Verrine Orations, 214
- Ullman's Sicconis Polentoni scriptorum Latinae linguae libri XVIII, 102-104
- White's The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay, 311
- Name (The) of the Isle of Man, 371
- of Les Andelys (Eure), 372
- Neuter Plural Subjects in Homer, Plural Verbs with, 71-78
- NICHOLS, EDWARD W. The

- Semantics of the Termination -Ario-, 40-63
 Notes on Cicero's Letters, 181-184
 Hofmann's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, 319-340
 the *Agricola* of Tacitus, 266-272
 NUTTING, H. C. Notes on the *Agricola* of Tacitus, 266-272
 Review of Flinck-Linkomies' De ablative absoluto quaestiones, 399-403
Octavius, The Date of the, 185-189
 On the Declension of Substantive Compounds in Lithuanian, 156-167
 Oriental Elements in Petronius, 378-385
 Papyrus Fragments of Extant Greek Literature, 255-265, 409
 Papyrus Fragments, Two, of Homer, 386-389
 PERRY, B. E. Review of Sage's Petronius, The Satiricon, 300-304
 Petronius, Oriental Elements in, 378-385
 The Text-Tradition of, 21-39
 Phileros, The Inscription of, 279-285
 Plural Verbs with Neuter Plural Subjects in Homer, 71-78
 Political (The) Activities and the Name of Cratesipolis, 273-278
 Pre-Indo-European (A) Change of *u* to *m* after *u* or *o*, 360-369
 RAND, E. K. Review of Tardi's Fortunat, 312-313
 Reports:
 Glotta, 86-89; 295-296; 390-393
 Hermes, 286-295
 Mnemosyne, 200-204
 Philologus, 394-398
 Rheinisches Museum, 79-85
 Rivista di Filologia, 198-200
 Reviews:
 Amatucci's Storia della Letteratura latina cristiana, 214
 Brinkmann's Zum Ursprung des liturgischen Spieles, 406-407
 Cambridge (The) Ancient History, Vol. VII, 304-309
 Christopher's S. Aureli Augustini de catechizandis rudibus, 105-106
 Dobie's Jouguet's Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, 311-312
 Duff's Lucan, 213-214
 Elmer's Latin Grammar, 90-95
 Flinck-Linkomies' De ablative absoluto quaestiones, 399-403
 Fränkel's Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechevers, 95-99
 Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache, 215-216
 Greenwood's Cicero, The Verine Orations, 214
 Ipsen und Karg's Schallanalytische Versuche, 309-310
 Keith's A History of Sanskrit Literature, 208-211
 Krahe's Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen, 205-208
 Lindsay's Palaeographia Latina, Part V, 408
 Löfstedt's Syntactica, 211-213
 Mustard's Aeneae Silvii de curialium miseriis epistola, 408-409
 Richmond's Sexti Propertii quae supersunt opera, 296-300
 Rietra's C. Suetoni Tranquilli vita Tiberi, 313-314
 Roberts' Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism, 100-102
 Sage's Petronius, The Satiricon, 300-304
 Severyns' Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, 403-405
 Sjögren's M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum epistularum libri sedecim, 405-406
 Tardi's Fortunat, 312-313
 Ullman's Sicconis Polentoni scriptorum Latinae linguae libri XVIII, 102-104
 White's The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay, 311
 Williams' Cicero, The Letters to His Friends, 104-105
Rhetoric, Aristotle, 3. 16. 1417b 16-20, 170-180
 ROBINSON, C. A., JR. The Seer Aristander, 195-197
 Review of Dobie's Jouguet's

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY
No. 6 (1929)

EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS

PART I. THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT

BY

GEORGE E. MYLONAS, PH. D.

Foreword by DAVID M. ROBINSON

Quarto. xviii + 108 pages of text.

Two colored plates. Ninety-four other plates with illustrations.

Cloth, \$7.50.

This volume is a final and complete publication of all the neolithic finds made in the excavations conducted at Olynthus by the Johns Hopkins University under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, in which Dr. Mylonas himself took part. This settlement dates earlier than the earliest city found by Schliemann at Troy, at least 3000 B. C. It is the first neolithic site to be thoroughly excavated and published in Macedonia, and many of the finds are unique, such as the only neolithic kiln yet found in Greece. The pottery includes monochrome ware with black shiny or red slipped surface, incised ware with linear and curvilinear patterns, and painted vases, many pieces beautiful and unique. A zoomorphic vase is the earliest of its kind in Greece. Ten marble, stone and clay idols of the amorphous standing type which represent the Mother Goddess are the earliest found in Macedonia, and they throw much light on the history of early Greek religion. Among the nearly one hundred stone celts are well-known mainland types but also two new types. Among the smaller finds are whorls and sling bullets, grinders and mortars, shell and bone ornaments, and tools. Carbonized remains of millet, wheat, and even figs, and many bones of domesticated animals were found, proving the agricultural and pastoral character of the Stone Age inhabitants of Olynthus. The connections with Central Macedonia, Thessaly, the Aegean Islands, with Southern Greece, with Thrace, with the Danubian Region, with the Black Earth Region of Transylvania, with Asia Minor are all carefully studied and important historical conclusions drawn therefrom. The Olynthian settlement antedates the earliest Central Macedonian culture and is not Indo-European, but connected with Asia Minor.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,
Baltimore, Maryland

